

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME I

JUNE, 1906

NUMBER 7

Editorial

THE ST. LOUIS MEETING

An unusually efficient local committee, a good programme, and a large attendance combined to make the second annual meeting of the Association a distinct success. The gracious hospitality of Washington University, of the St. Louis Wednesday Club, and of the trustees of the Missouri Botanical Garden will not soon be forgotten by those who had the good fortune to be present. Table d'hôte luncheons, receptions, and banquets of pontifical splendor are not, perhaps, essential parts of a classical meeting, but after our St. Louis experience we can only regret that they are not. The wheels of philology ran none the less smoothly.

Most of the papers on the programme were contributed by members of the Association. Institutions outside our territory, however, were represented by Professor Knapp, of Columbia University, and Dean West, of Princeton. Professor Knapp's paper presented the results of an elaborate investigation of all the passages in Plautus and Terence bearing on travel. Skilfully piecing together the scattered bits of evidence, he reconstructed the ancient itineraries, the means and methods of transportation, and the facilities provided for travelers. Professor West's address was entitled "The Personal Touch." It dealt with the preceptorial system of instruction at Princeton, of which, since its inauguration last fall, Professor West himself has been *magna pars*. The speaker rapidly sketched the inception and development of the system. He showed in what ways it resembled, and in what ways it differed from its prototype, the tutorial system of the English universities. Briefly stated, the problem was to determine "whether it was possible, in

the teaching of the classics or of any other subject, for the instructor to get so close to the student that the immediate impression of his teaching would be driven home with the same irresistible force that results from the intimate talk of two friends on things in which they are both interested." As an example of the method employed, Professor West described the freshman course in *Livy*. The students are divided into sections of twenty-five each. It is a four-hour course: on three days in the week the section meets as a class, the time being devoted to reading assigned portions or at sight; the other hour is the preceptorial period, and is devoted principally to linguistic work, with Latin prose composition as its basis. For this the preceptor takes the members of his section in small groups of four or five. This group meets him in his study at one hour, that group at another. So he is able to come into close personal contact with each student, to see where he is weak or where he is strong, to ascertain his individual bent and interests, and to direct his studies in accordance with them. The instruction during the preceptorial hour is in the highest degree informal, and no record is kept of the student's attendance. Professor West added many other details and illustrations of method. His closing words sum up admirably the underlying principle of the system: "For the personal touch of the individual instructor on the individual student there are many substitutes, but no equivalent."

Among the more technical papers read were Professor Hendrickson's "Literary Sources in Cicero's Dialogues and the Technique of Their Citation;" Professor Capps's "The More Ancient Dionysia at Athens;" and Professor Sanders' "The Chronology of Early Rome." In the rest of the programme special prominence was given to subjects of immediate interest to secondary teachers. Mr. Lothman outlined the place of Latin in the high-school curriculum; Miss Bessie Snyder gave a specially interesting demonstration of the effectiveness of a Latin Club in vitalizing the classical work in high schools; while Professor Hale, after reading his paper on "The Quantitative Pronunciation of Latin and its Meaning for Latin Versification," gave a practical illustration of his theory by reading a number of selections from Latin poetry. Professor Hale's belief is that, if students are trained from the beginning to pronounce all Latin words with strict regard to quantity, they will experience little or no difficulty when

they come to the reading of Latin verse; in reading, when ictus and word-accent conflict, both should be heard, but the former the more lightly. These papers were followed by long discussions.

The various committees appointed at the business session on Friday morning reported to the Association on Saturday. Officers for the ensuing year were nominated and unanimously elected as follows: President, Professor M. S. Slaughter, University of Wisconsin; First Vice-President, Professor F. C. Eastman, Iowa State Normal School; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor B. L. D'Ooge, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti; member of the Executive Committee, Professor F. W. Shipley, Washington University. The question of relations with other associations, with special reference to their co-operation in the *Classical Journal*, was referred to the Executive Committee with power to act. Among the many resolutions passed, none received more hearty endorsement than that which put on record the gratitude of the Association to the out-going President, Professor W. G. Manly, for his zealous and efficient administration.

In conclusion, it may be said not only that the meeting was successful in itself, but that it gave sure promise of a bright future for the Association. The sessions, the discussions, the informal gatherings, were marked by an enthusiasm which showed clearly the forces inherent in the organization. Every intelligent classical teacher today knows that this is no time for inertia; that the standard of teaching in classical courses must be of the highest; that the results of classical teaching must be manifestly good; and that the utmost vigilance and energy are necessary in every department of the work. To get the benefits of co-operation in striving for these ideals the Association was founded. That the ideals are to be realized this meeting has given a sign of no uncertain meaning.

AMERICAN DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS, 1900-1905

The status of the different branches of classical study in the graduate schools of the country is clearly indicated by the list of dissertations given on pp. 233 ff. Out of a total of 140, 62 deal exclusively with Greek subjects, 72 exclusively with Latin, 4 with both Greek and

Latin, and 2 with Sanskrit—figures which show that in the universities at least the prestige of Greek is unimpaired. The subjects represented show a wide range. We find grammar (three or four departments), literature, philosophy, religion, mythology, history, antiquities of various kinds, archaeology, epigraphy, palaeography, and topography. The view, that so frequently finds expression in foreign journals, that American classical scholarship runs to syntax is confirmed by this list, in which there are 26 dissertations dealing with syntactical themes alone—a much larger representation than is found in any other definitely circumscribed department. Of these the great majority are on the Latin side: 19, to 7 in Greek. The dissertations in prosody, phonetics, and lexicography, 15 in all, with Latin again preponderating, make a total output in the grammatical field of 41, or nearly 30 per cent. of the whole. In philosophy there are 8 dissertations: 5 in Greek, 3 in Latin. That Greek should have the larger representation here is of course natural; of the Latin theses 2 are ethical disquisitions, and 1 a discussion of philosophical terms in Lucretius. Of the 9 papers in religion and mythology, 6 are primarily Greek, the richer mythology accounting for the preponderance here. Yet that Roman religion should be represented in so long a list by only 2 theses is surprising. The meager showing in history, 6 in all (4 Greek, 2 Latin), is another indication of the shameful neglect of ancient history in almost all our universities. In antiquities the output is encouraging, but, in consideration of the size of the field, still inadequate: in military antiquities we have 2 (Latin), in legal and institutional 9 (3 Greek, 6 Latin), while scenic questions are well represented by 4 (3 Greek, 1 Latin). In archaeology there are 5, all Greek. In palaeography, on the other hand, we find 4 in Latin and none in Greek; while in epigraphy there are 4 in Latin to 2 in Greek. The remaining dissertations deal with miscellaneous philological questions connected for the most part with individual authors—questions of sources, influence, chronology, figures of speech, and so forth. Here the Greek theses are slightly more numerous than the Latin. Of the whole number, 62—i. e., about 44 per cent.—have been published.

THE MOVEMENTS OF ARIOVISTUS BEFORE HIS INTERVIEW WITH CAESAR

BY ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER
University of Kansas

If one notices the almost total lack of definite statements about Ariovistus in the second half of Caesar's first book, he will not be surprised at the slight interest shown in his movements by students of the campaigns. On so scant a foundation of fact it seems absurd to build a theory. My justification for attempting the task lies in my belief that Colonel Stoffel's identification of the battlefield is absolutely untenable, unless the movements of Ariovistus can be explained otherwise than as Colonel Stoffel has explained them. The explanation which I shall offer is admittedly incapable of proof. I offer it, however, not for the sake of theorizing, but as a help to the acceptance of Colonel Stoffel's theory.

This paper will take into account only two possible locations of the battlefield, both in Upper Alsace. Those who locate the battlefield west of the Vosges Mountains have been sufficiently pulverized by Mr. Holmes, and nothing in this paper touches on their theories. The theater of operations is assumed to be somewhere in the Alsatian plain, between the Vosges Mountains and the Rhine. Until 1890 the commonly accepted location of the battlefield was near Cernay, in the southwestern part of Upper Alsace. Von Göler, Napoleon, and Van Kampen agree in this general location, while disagreeing in details. But in 1890 Colonel Stoffel (*Guerre de César et d'Arioviste*) made it probable that the battle was fought in the extreme northern part of Upper Alsace, between Ostheim and Gemar. This location is now almost universally accepted.

The most important question which this paper attempts to answer is: Why was Ariovistus encamped so far to the north at the time of his interview with Caesar (i. 41. 5)? I shall try to show that we might have expected him to await Caesar's arrival somewhere near Cernay. In fact, however, if the battle was fought near Cernay,

Ariovistus was encamped twenty-four Roman miles north of this point. Commentators found this no serious difficulty, although they offered most unsatisfactory explanations for it. But when Colonel Stoffel located the battlefield in the northern part of Upper Alsace, he was obliged to put Ariovistus near Strassburg, more than fifty miles from the point at which we should expect to find him. Colonel Stoffel himself felt the difficulty and discusses the movements of Ariovistus at length (pp. 87-92), but his explanation seems to be absolutely impossible.

A second question is as to the origin of the report (i. 38. 1) that Ariovistus was marching on Vesontio. Nothing hinges on this question, it is true, but it is somewhat puzzling. It is clear that the report was false; for if it was true, Ariovistus must have retreated for several days before Caesar. But neither was Ariovistus the man to retreat, nor is it possible that Caesar should have failed to mention the retreat of so boastful a foe. Yet it is hard to believe that there was no basis of fact for the report. What motive had anyone for wilfully deceiving Caesar? How dared he bring Caesar a story which was pure invention? How did he convince Caesar of his trustworthiness?

A third question must be answered before the other two can be discussed. Where was the territory of Ariovistus, out of which he was reported (i. 38. 1) to have marched for three days? Here, as in everything else that concerns the movements of Ariovistus, I find hopeless confusion in the standard works on Caesar, and this confusion is repeated in our school editions.

If this last question, as to the territory of Ariovistus, were not complicated by later developments of the campaign, I am confident that all would agree in assigning Upper Alsace to the Germans. Yet, so far as I have been able to examine the literature of the subject, no one holds this view, at least consistently. As the whole of my future argument depends on the admission that the territory of Ariovistus was, at any rate approximately, Upper Alsace, the question must be discussed at some length.

In chap. 31 Diviciacus tells Caesar that Ariovistus has settled (*consedisset*) in the territory of the Sequani and has seized a third of their land; that he is now ordering the Sequani to vacate a second

third, in order to provide homes for the Harudes. In chap. 32 he repeats the statement that the Sequani have received Ariovistus into their territory. Diviciacus probably exaggerated the amount of land taken; but how can anyone doubt that the land from which Ariovistus had expelled the Sequani, and in which he had settled, was his territory? And when in chap. 38 Caesar tells of the report that Ariovistus had marched three days *a suis finibus*, is it not to be understood that he refers to this third of the Sequanian land? It would seem that we have one sure fact to serve as a corner-stone of any theory which expects our acceptance. And yet, neither Von Göler nor Napoleon nor Colonel Stoffel builds on this corner-stone.

We have next to decide what part of Sequania Ariovistus took. No one who locates the battlefield in Alsace denies that the part taken lies along the Rhine. It remains only to determine its boundaries as well as we may. As the plain of Upper Alsace contains no natural barriers to form frontiers, we may assume that Ariovistus took it all. Besides, his army was too large to be satisfied with less; and, as the whole plain is less than one-third of Sequania, we have allowed sufficiently for exaggeration on the part of Diviciacus. Probably Ariovistus did not care for the hilly and mountainous land along the borders of Alsace. Then the southwestern boundary of his territory lay a little inside the boundary of Upper Alsace, and a little southwest of Cernay. The northern frontier can not be determined with certainty. Colonel Stoffel argues (p. 89) that the boundary between Upper and Lower Alsace has all the features which would have made it the natural northern frontier of the Sequani. There seems to be no sound argument for extending their territory farther north than this. Mr. Holmes, who wishes to make Lower Alsace the territory of Ariovistus, represents them on his map as extending to Strassburg; but on p. 492 he himself refutes the one argument for doing so which he offers doubtfully on p. 484. It seems certain, then, that Ariovistus possessed Upper Alsace, with possibly a part of Lower Alsace.

But, however reasonable this view may appear, no one seems to have accepted it. Von Göler admits (p. 41) that Ariovistus had seized Upper Alsace, but thinks (p. 42) that when Caesar speaks of Ariovistus' territory he means Württemberg, across the Rhine. Napo-

leon, too, admits (p. 77, French; p. 91, English) that Ariovistus had seized Upper Alsace, but he seems to think (p. 78, French; p. 92, English) that the territory of Ariovistus was that of the Triboci, north of Strassburg. Colonel Stoffel makes no reference to the seizure of Sequanian territory, and assigns to Ariovistus the land of the Triboci (p. 90). Mr. Holmes (p. 629) recognizes the fact that the territory of Ariovistus lay in Sequania, but he puts Ariovistus' southern boundary two or three days' march north of Cernay, thus giving him only a part of Lower Alsace.

Evidently some serious difficulty has prevented these men from accepting the natural interpretation of Caesar's words. The same difficulty has induced Meusel to follow a few other editors in bracketing Caesar's statement that Ariovistus was reported to have marched three days out of his territory (i. 38. 1). This difficulty is simply that, if Ariovistus had marched three days out of the Alsatian plain, he was much nearer Vesontio than Caesar was when he turned and raced for that town. It seems to be universally assumed that Caesar would not have tried to outstrip Ariovistus unless he had had an even start. Napoleon and Colonel Stoffel are the most definite. They locate Caesar at Arc-en-Barrois, one hundred and thirty kilometers from Vesontio, and Ariovistus at Cernay, one hundred and twenty-five kilometers from the same point. They are willing to handicap Caesar by five kilometers. Apparently anything more than that would have discouraged Caesar's feeble spirit. But I should like to ask what they suppose Caesar would have done if he had believed, what his words plainly mean, that Ariovistus was three days' march beyond Cernay. He had started to find Ariovistus. If Ariovistus was to be found at Vesontio, Caesar had to go there. The only question for him was whether he should try to get there first. If he tried and succeeded, he would win a very great advantage. If he tried and failed, he would fatigue his army, it is true, but otherwise he would be no worse off than if he did not try. In such a case, so far as I know, Caesar never failed for lack of trying.

It must be admitted, however, that Caesar would not have wearied his army uselessly, if he had been sure that there was no chance of success. Had he a chance? I shall have something more to say

of the report later. For the present allow me to assume that the messenger reported to Caesar, not that at the time when he left Ariovistus the Germans had already marched three days, but that, judging from what he had seen, they must have advanced three days at the time of making his report. The border of the Alsatian plain is a little less than eighty miles from Vesontio by road. Part of the way was rough, as Diviciacus could have told him. Caesar must have known that Ariovistus would travel with his ox-carts and his women and children. Might he not hope that the Germans would require five or six days to complete the march? If so, he had two or three days left. Napoleon and Colonel Stoffel assume that Caesar was at Arc-en-Barrois, about eighty miles from Vesontio. He may have been nearer, and at any rate he could not know the exact distances. By marching day and night he may have hoped to cover the distance in the two or three days left him. I believe that on this showing alone there was enough to justify Caesar in making the effort. But if this seems extravagant, there is another consideration which seems to have escaped notice. Vesontio was an exceedingly strong town. Apparently it was in the hands of the Sequani. The Sequani knew that Caesar was marching against Ariovistus. Surely Caesar might hope that they would hold the town till he could arrive.

Accordingly, we need not admit the slightest necessity either for bracketing the statement that Ariovistus had marched for three days out of his territory, or for pushing the boundary of his territory three days' march or more back from the nearest boundary of the Alsatian plain. Nothing stands in the way of a belief that that plain was his territory.

And now we reach the important question which needs to be answered before we can accept Colonel Stoffel's location of the battle-field. Why was Ariovistus encamped so far to the north at the time of his interview with Caesar?

This question may well be asked, even if we cling to the older view that the battle was fought near Cernay. Since Upper Alsace was Ariovistus' territory, why was he not awaiting Caesar's approach near Cernay, so as to protect his southwestern frontier? Why was he in the northern half of his territory? Napoleon's answer to this question

is (pp. 78, 81, French; pp. 92, 95, English) that Ariovistus had been recruiting his army among the Triboci, and that he had marched toward Caesar very slowly because he did not wish to get farther away from the Suebi, who were trying to cross the Rhine at Mainz. The location and status of these Triboci make a puzzling question, into which the limits of this paper do not permit my entering. But the fact that they retained their Gallic possessions somewhere north of Strassburg after the battle seems to me sufficient evidence that they were not the Triboci who took part in the battle. Moreover, Ariovistus showed no wish to keep near the Suebi when he marched against Caesar after the interview; nor is this surprising, in view of the fact that he was already about one hundred and forty miles from them in a straight line. Von Göler of course finds no difficulty here, since he gives Ariovistus the impossible location across the Rhine. Consequently we are left with no satisfactory answer to the question, even on the assumption that the battle was fought at Cernay.

But on Colonel Stoffel's theory an answer to the question is absolutely necessary. He puts the battle in the extreme northern part of Upper Alsace. Ariovistus was therefore encamped, at the time of the interview, about twenty miles north of his probable northern frontier, more than sixty miles in a straight line from the southwestern frontier which he ought to have been defending. For what possible reason was he so far north? His immediate march against Caesar, after the interview, shows that he had not withdrawn in fear of the Romans. The same march shows that he was not strategically drawing Caesar away from his base of supplies; for, if that had been his purpose, he would have forced Caesar to come to him, and would thus have drawn him twenty-four miles farther.

Colonel Stoffel's answer to this question has already been intimated. It is that the territory of Ariovistus was that of the Triboci, north of Strassburg. He supposes that during the preliminary negotiations Ariovistus was about seventy miles north of Strassburg, and by somewhat arbitrary calculations (p. 91) he tries to show that the German king would have had just time to learn of Caesar's approach, to collect his army, and to march down to the neighborhood of Strassburg by the day on which Caesar reached his final camping-ground on the Fecht.

This theory has at least the one merit of making Ariovistus do what he ought to have done, namely, march to meet Caesar and protect his southern frontier. But, in the face of Caesar's positive statements, it is incredible that the territory of Ariovistus was among the Triboci or anywhere else outside of Sequania. Besides, why should he have settled among the Triboci? He was not a homeless refugee, glad to find shelter among his kinsmen, but a conqueror, able and willing to take his pick of the Gallic land; which is just what Caesar says he did do. That Colonel Stoffel should have brought himself to propound such a view is good evidence that he recognized the necessity of some explanation. It is most surprising that Mr. Holmes, who certainly does not agree with Colonel Stoffel on this point, should not have seen the plight in which Colonel Stoffel's whole theory of the campaign is left when this explanation is removed; but there is not a word to show that he did see it.

The explanation which I wish to offer rests upon an assumption which can never be proved; but, so far as I can see, it involves the contradiction of no known fact. It aims to account for both the position of Ariovistus and the origin of the report that he had marched toward Vesontio. In chap. 37 we are told that the Suebi were attempting to cross the Rhine into the territory of the Treveri, and that Caesar feared a junction of that force with Ariovistus. Although the Treveri were able to prevent the Suebi from crossing, and did prevent it by their unaided strength, yet they appealed to Caesar for assistance. Perhaps they feared that Ariovistus would march against them and thus assist the plans of the Suebi. Nothing is more likely than that, if Ariovistus had been let alone, he would have done just this. If he wanted the Suebi to cross at all, the only alternative was to force them to march up the right bank of the Rhine, through a most difficult country, and then let them cross into his own territory, where he would have been obliged to provision them for a time. My assumption is that Ariovistus did actually begin a march northward to assist the Suebi.

If one makes this assumption, everything becomes clear. The tone of Ariovistus' replies to Caesar's envoys shows that he had no fear of Caesar, and he probably had no idea that Caesar would march against him. He was in his own territory, Upper Alsace, probably

well to the south, where he could keep better control over the Sequani. His army was scattered, as appears from his own statement in chap. 34. He could not hope to deceive Caesar on such a point, because the envoy would have reported the truth. He decided to march against the Treveri, and collected his army for this purpose. Caesar would naturally have detailed scouts or spies to watch his movements. One of them, seeing these preparations, jumped to the conclusion that he was going to secure Vesontio. In order to lose no time, he did not wait for Ariovistus to begin his march, but hurried to Caesar. His journey might take three or four days. When he got there, his report was that Ariovistus had been just about to march and must now be three days out of his territory. There was too much at stake to permit of delay, and Caesar started for Vesontio without waiting for later messengers. But in the meantime Ariovistus had leisurely marched north toward the point at which the Suebi were trying to cross the Rhine, at least one hundred and forty miles away in a straight line. After a few days he learned that Caesar was marching toward him. Though he did not dread either Caesar or the Treveri, he did not wish to be caught between them. The affair of the Treveri and the Suebi could wait, but Caesar must be kept away. Therefore he turned and marched back to the south. When he reached the neighborhood of Strassburg, he learned that Caesar was twenty-four miles from him, and he sent envoys with a proposal for a conference. Then the story goes on as Colonel Stoffel has told it.

A BROADER OUTLOOK FOR STUDENTS OF CICERO

All who have taught the classics are probably conscious that a portion, and no small portion, of the difficulty which the average student encounters in the early years of his pursuit of Latin and Greek, arises from the lack of familiarity with the thought of classical writers and with the civilization which gave color to their thought. The boy may painfully acquire the multitudinous forms, he may overcome by diligent effort the perplexity of new grammatical constructions, he may even familiarize himself with numerous strange words of the strange tongue—and still the difference between his own point of view and that of the writer may cause a mist hopelessly to obscure the thought. If we can in imagination put ourselves in the place of a young student who has never been far beyond the borders of the little town where he lives, whose knowledge of life is limited to what he sees and hears in that narrow environment, supplemented by the few books which he studies and the even fewer which he reads, then we can appreciate his need of help to understand the literature of the ancients.

In first-year Latin this difficulty is minimized by the character of the text put before the pupil. In the second year the Latin read is restricted in subject and somewhat picturesque, and considerable opportunity is offered, by the introductory matter in our Caesars, for becoming acquainted with the military dress and equipments of the common soldier, the construction of the camp, the siege works, the organization of the army.

By the time the third year is reached difficulties of the language have decreased and the student has acquired some facility in meeting them. But just here the thought becomes more abstruse, and the difficulty of comprehending the situation portrayed is increased many fold. Yet the need is imperative, for, as another has said, "It is impossible to read understandingly an ode of Horace or an oration of Cicero, if one is ignorant of the social life and the political institutions of Rome."

Without effort on the part of both pupil and teacher the boy will fail to comprehend the dread and apprehension of that famous eighth of November on which Cicero first turned the power of his oratory against Catiline. He will not see the dark and narrow streets of Rome, lighted at night only by a lantern here and there, which some enterprising Roman has hung above his door, or the occasional gleam of a torch which a servant bears in advance of a party of late revelers on their return homeward from some

antelucanae ceneae. The boy will not feel that dread of fire at night which made the care to prevent conflagrations so important a part of the duties of *vigiliae* at all times, nor will he comprehend the special *timor populi* of those nights when rumors of the plans of the conspirators to burn the city were whispered about. Unaided he will not see the Palatine, just enough elevated to be a natural stronghold, a strategic situation, but under military guard only in time of danger. Nor will he see distinctly the senate, no longer "an assembly of kings" as in the days of old, but still made up of the wealth and social position and political success of the greatest nation then on the face of the earth. He will not be sure to notice that the senators are not in their usual place of meeting in the *curia*, but that Cicero, influenced partly by the nearness to his own house, has called them together in *hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus*, the temple of Jupiter Stator, the protector of the city.

If all these things are fully present to the boy's imagination, how much readier he is to enter upon the task of translation!

How best can we give our pupil the knowledge of these things, and how stimulate his imagination to grasp them? These two objects should be before us in dealing with the situation in this elementary stage, rather than any effort at formal discipline.

With some classes a good deal can be accomplished by calling attention to topics and suggesting that they be looked up. Usually I have found it best to cast to the winds all idea of task in connection with this study, to stimulate interest by saying something about topics in advance, to minimize the labor of the pupil by giving abundant specific references, and to have the recitations entirely voluntary—"little of the quiz, but interested conversation."

Occasionally topics may be assigned to the pupils severally as definite work, and a comprehensive effort within the range of their possibilities may be required. The young people may present to the class the results of their investigations in the form of oral reports from notes or of written papers, as they themselves choose. Dr. Prescott, of the University of California, says that there are many students in our classes to whom language work as such does not appeal, who yet can be interested on the literary side. He believes that Latin teachers' methods are adapted too exclusively to minds of the linguistic type, and that we should do more to interest and develop the others. To those pupils who shrink from work that is purely linguistic as drudgery, this study of antiquities will often prove a delight; and while all students enjoy making a supreme effort and doing the best of which they are capable, not infrequently the one whose daily work is poor will

develop a surprising power in this new direction, be able to contribute largely to the success of the hour, and receive the stimulus which the sense of excellence gives.

Care should be exercised lest the practical needs of the pupil be sacrificed to the scholarly standards of the teacher. The aim should be undeviatingly to get before the pupil the most accurate and vivid picture of the situation as it appeared to a dweller at Rome in the autumn of the year 63 B. C. Accordingly, only the more picturesque of the concepts should be dwelt upon—those which illumine the text.

With this notion in mind, I recently read the first two Catilinarian orations and noted a number of such topics. Military subjects were omitted, with the thought that Caesar had afforded large opportunity for their study. Some of those selected would be ranked as private antiquities, some as public; part are institutional in character, part monumental; but all, if developed, would throw light upon Cicero's text:

Cat. I

Palati, 1.1	comitiis, 5.11	emori (suicide), 8.20
vigiliae, 1.1	campo, 5.11	abire (voluntary exile), 8.20
tabulis, 2.4	tempa, 5.12	sacrarium, 9.24
coloniam, 3.8	nuptiis, 6.14	gladiatori, 12.29
falcarios, 4.8	servi, 7.17	tribunal, 13.32
domum, 4.8	custodiam, 8.19	curiam, 13.32
lectulo, 4.9	carcere, 8.19	

Cat. II

foro, 1.1	ludo gladiatorio, 5.9	subselliorum, 6.12
praetexta, 2.4	scena, 5.9	familia, 8.18
popina, 2.4	vino, 5.10	tabulas novas, 8.18
vadimonia, 3.5	alea, 5.10	sumptibus, 10.21
unguentis, 3.5	conviviis, 5.10	iudiciis, 11.21
purpura, 3.5	conferti cibo, 5.10	proscriptione bonorum, 10.21
Aurelia via, 4.6	sertis, 5.10	togis, 10.22
veneficus, 4.7	luxuria, 5.11	cenis, 10.22
sicarius, 4.7	exsilium, 6.12	sicas et venena, 10.23
testamentorum, 4.7	aedem Iovis, 6.12	aerario, 11.25
ganeo, 4.7		

EMMA YOUNGLOVE

VENTURA, CAL.

Notes and Discussions

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to Henry A. Sanders, 1227 Washtenaw Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich.

XENOPHON ANAB. i. 7. 5

καὶ μήν, ὅτι Κύρε, λέγοντι τίνες ὅτι πολλὰ ὑπισχνεῖ νῦν διὰ τὸ ἐν τοιούτῳ εἶναι τοῦ κινδύνου προσιόντος.

In a note on this passage, in the April number of the *Journal*, Professor Shorey refers *ἐν τοιούτῳ* to *ὑπισχνεῖ*, with the meaning "in such a plight" (where promises are necessary). The suggestion is interesting and may be correct, but his conclusion that *τοῦ κινδύνου προσιόντος* is a genitive absolute does not follow from his premise. In other points also his reasoning seems to me to be defective. In the first place, he is inclined to doubt that *τοῦ κινδύνου* can depend upon *ἐν τοιούτῳ*, because he has not observed a case of *ἐν τοιούτῳ* with a partitive genitive; but an example occurs in Thuc. vii. 69. 2: *ἄλλα τε λέγων ὅσα ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἥδη τῷ καιρῷ ὄντες ἀνθρώποι εἴποιεν ἄν.* Secondly, he says that "*ἐν τοιούτῳ* occurs always, I think, with reference to something already described or implied." But *τοιοῦτος* is frequently explained by a following clause introduced by *οἵος*, *ὅς*, or *ὅτε* (for examples, see G. M. T. 576, 587), and surely Mr. Shorey would not claim that *ἐν τοιούτῳ* could not be used in such a sentence. Of course, this use of *τοιοῦτος* in no way implies that a genitive dependent upon *ἐν τοιούτῳ* can be explanatory of *τοιούτῳ*. And this leads me to another point in Mr. Shorey's argument, which is not directly stated, but may be fairly inferred. If I rightly understand his calling the partitive genitive in this passage "a difficult, and, if the article is retained, perhaps impossible, construction," he has in mind as a possible translation, if the article is omitted, "in such a position of approaching danger." In this phrase "such" looks backward and "of approaching danger" is a *descriptive* genitive dependent upon the noun "position" and explanatory of "such." Of course, Mr. Shorey may not have had this translation in mind, but what else does his difficulty with the article mean? For if the genitive is truly partitive—and, to my mind, if dependent upon *ἐν τοιούτῳ* it is partitive and not descriptive—the phrase is as easily translated with the article as without it. Without the article it is "at such a point in the approach of danger;" with

the article it is "at such a point in the approach of the danger," i. e., *the* well-known danger of the approaching battle. If the "partition" of the idea "the approach of danger" seems difficult and unnatural, it is only necessary to recall Thucydides' *ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ τοῦ καιροῦ*; it is the Greek, and not the English, way of putting it. Finally, to return to Mr. Shorey's claim that the genitive is absolute because *ἐν τοιούτῳ* refers to *ὑπισχνεῖ*, it is evident that if the words mean "at such a point in the approach of the danger," the "such" can either refer back to *ὑπισχνεῖ* or—and this is more natural—to the present, well-recognized situation. In either case *τοιούτῳ* refers backward, as Mr. Shorey claims it should, and the genitive is still left partitive. Vollbrecht, by the way, calls the genitive absolute; Goodwin is doubtful. I incline to the partitive view myself. It is probable enough that *ἐν τοιούτῳ* with a partitive genitive existed in Greek before the development of the absolute construction, and it seems to me likely that a genitive following closely upon *ἐν τοιούτῳ* would always have suggested the partitive meaning. But I see no reason why the Greek could not have said "because you are in such a position—the danger being close at hand." The absolute construction would be an explanatory afterthought; it would be more natural in speaking than in writing.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that most of the manuscripts have *τοῦ κινδύνου τοῦ προσιόντος*. The editors generally omit the second *τοῦ* on the authority of the Paris C.

A. G. LAIRD

XENOPHON *ANAB.* i. 7. 5 AGAIN

I doubt whether there is any cogent reason for finding in the passage *Anab.* i. 7. 5 a different construction from those cited by Goodwin 1088. The article here has evidently a slightly demonstrative force and refers to the particular peril now impending. The participle has the position at the end of the sentence for rhetorical emphasis: the danger is the one now approaching. The speaker expected the king to attack at once. Kendrick translates the passage, "in such a crisis of danger," and more fully at another place, "because you are in such a crisis of coming danger." He explains that "*κινδύνου* depends on neut. *τοιούτῳ*; *προσιόντος* (omit *τοῦ* with the best MSS) attached predicatively to *κινδύνου*." However, the multiplication of modern authorities in such cases profiteth little. Thucydides vii. 69 has *ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἥδη τοῦ καιροῦ ὅντες ἀνθρωποι*, which Jowett translates "at such times," and Bloomfield "in such a conjunction." Here the demonstrative force of *τοῦ* is evidently emphasized

by *ηδη*. In Thucyd. iii. 49 we have *παρὰ τοσοῦτον . . . κυδίνου*, which is virtually the same construction without the article. The particular construction here employed seems to be unique—at least I find no similar one by a tolerably careful examination of the *Anabasis*. If the passage is really Xenophon's own, I believe the above explanation will suffice. On the other hand, as the speech is a short one and was made on a specially important occasion, the historian may have remembered it literally, in which case it is not wise to apply the rules of rhetoric too rigidly. If the second person were not implied in the verb, we should probably have it expressed with the infinitive. As the sentence stands, it is not ambiguous. To explain the three genitives as a case of the absolute construction seems to detract from the compactness of the sentence.

CHARLES W. SUPER

ATHENS, OHIO

THE MEANING OF $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\eta\tau\iota$, AESCHYLUS *PROMETHEUS* 860

In only one of my new interpretations of the *Prometheus* does Mr. Bonner decide in favor of Wecklein.¹ The purpose of this paper is to show that the position of the German scholar here too (v. 860) can not be successfully defended. Mr. Bonner speaks of my "curt dismissal" of Wecklein's note as "not convincing." In the narrow compass of a note, in an edition in which the plan of annotation demanded that brevity be constantly studied, it was impossible to publish the reasons in full for my interpretation.

Mr. Bonner admits that the passages cited by Wecklein are "not exactly analogous." The only defense of the traditional interpretation offered is: "in view of vss. 856-59 it seems much more natural to supply *αὐτοῖς* with Wecklein, whose defense of the peculiar construction seems sufficient." But the difficulty does not lie in the construction—*δαμέντων* for *δαμέντας* is easy—an example of a common phenomenon in Aeschylus to which I had already called attention.

In the first place, the very fact that Wecklein proposes *δ̄αιμάξεται* shows (1) that he is not satisfied himself with *δέξεται* (which is found in all the manuscripts), and (2) that he can not get away from the idea that the verb has to do with the pursuers rather than the pursued. The same may be said of Pauw, who changes *δέξεται* to *δέρξεται* and *δαμέντων* to *δαμέντας*. Hartung does even greater violence to the text and changes *δέξεται* to *κλάγξεται*.

¹In his review of my edition in the March number of this *Journal*.

In the second place, the very verses cited by Mr. Bonner to support his contention force me to the conclusion that *αὐτάς* is the object the poet had in mind. It is the sluggish northern mind that feels an unnaturalness in the sudden shift. The mobile Greek experienced no difficulty. The change to him was as easy as his wonted rapid change of tense. We must go even farther back than 856 to get the whole truth: *πάλιν πρὸς Ἀργος οὐχ ἕκοῦ ἐλεύσεται . . . φεύγοντα . . . θηρεύοντες*—and then suddenly *Πελασγία δὲ δέξεται*. Whom? Certainly not the cousins, the *κίρκοι* swooping fleetly after the trembling doves. *They* need no refuge. Furthermore, we know nothing of their condition as yet that would justify our inferring that *δέξεται* is not used in the ordinary sense of affording shelter, even if we grant that *Πελασγία* here signifies *γῆ* ("earth," "sod"), instead of "country." And it is the *γάννα πεντρυκοτάπαις* we are interested in, not the *ἀνεψιοί*. In the whole story it is the fortunes of the descendants of Io that are uppermost in the narrator's mind, and we interrupt the course of that story by injecting such a notion as *δέξεται αὐτούς*. Whether Pelasgic earth will cover them or not does not concern us. We want to know the fate of those hunted maidens that have come back to their ancestral home—*τίνα χῶρον ἐλεύσομαι; τίς δόμος δέξεται;* (Nonnus xxxi. 231).

When Dionysus and his train come to this same Argos, one of the god's retainers is told by a *Πελασγίδος ἀστός* to go back to Thebes (= *Πελασγία σε οὐ δέξεται*): *"Ιναχον . . . ἀναίνεο· καὶ σε δεχέσθω | Θήβης . . . ποταμός* (Nonnus xlvi. 496 f.). The Danaids were trying to escape from the violent and licentious Egyptians; Pelasgia saved them; but this could only be after they had rid themselves of their lords (tersely expressed by the aorist passive participle); hence the poet explains immediately (the narrative demanded conciseness): *θηλυκτόνῳ Ἀρει δαμέντων*. A just proportion precluded the expansion of this story. Otherwise Aeschylus would not have left us in doubt as to what he had in mind. But he was forced to severe compression, and with a stroke of the pen he gives us the incidental circumstance of the fate of the pursuers from whose clutches the maidens were trying to escape—these descendants of swarthy Touchborn, to whom we are assured Pelasgia will give a hearty welcome. Compare the experience of another fugitive, and note the verbs: *ὅς σε δίωκε . . . ἡμετέρη δεχέσθω . . . οὐ Θέτις Ἰνδόνη σε δεδέξεται, οὐδέ σε κόλπῳ | ξεινοδόκον μετὰ κῦμα πάλιν φεύγοντα σαύσοτε* (Nonnus xxvii. 41 ff.). Cf. also x. 90 ff. (*εἰς τίνα φεύγεις; ποῖον ὄρος δέχεται σε πεφυγμένον*), and xiii. 23. The Danaids came back to Argos (854), and Pelasgia received them hospitably; they dwelt in Argos in peace: *εἰς δόμος ἔστω . . . ἵξομαι εἰς ἐμὸν Ἀργος . . . ναιεράσσοντα . . . δεχέσθω* (xxxi. 255), *Μαιονίη πολύολβος ἐὸν ναέτην με,*

δεχέσθω (xxxiii. 254), Βριτόμαρτις ἦν ἐδίωκε δέξο, δέξο, θάλασσα, φιλοξείνω σέο κόλπῳ . . . δέξο Βριτόμαρτιν ἀναινομένην ὑμεναίους | ὅφρα φύγω Μορρῆα καὶ ὑμετέρην Ἀφροδίτην (xxxiii. 333 f.)—precisely the plight of the Danaids. Cypris passed Paphos and Byblos, and was first received in the οἶκος Ἐρώτων by Beroe: πρώτη Κύπριν ἔδεκτο φιλοξείνω πολεῶν (xli. 97). The Egyptian maidens left the banks of the Nile and came to the hospitable shores of Greece to dwell in μεγάλᾳ Πελασγίᾳ καὶ κατ' Ἀργος (Eur. *Suppl.* 367 f.)—λιπῶν Λιβάνοιο λόφον ἔξει εἰς Φρυγίην εὐπάρθεον Θρήκη νυμφοκόμος σε δεδέξεται (xlvi. 429 ff.). The lascivious lords were in hot pursuit ἐπτομένοι φρένας, and each maiden chased (or chaste) in wild despair exclaimed: εἰς τίνα φεύγω τίς πόλις ὀθνείη με δεδέξεται (xlvi. 260 ff.). When Oedipus says ὃ Κιθαιρών, τί μ' ἔδέχον; (*O. T.* 1390), he is not thinking of οὔμὸς Κιθαιρῶν οὔτος, ὃν ἐθέσθην ζῶντι κύριον τάφον (1452 f.). The idea of receiving into one's home is inseparably connected with δέχεσθαι in all periods of the literature. Cf. Nonnus iv. 143 δέχνυσσο δειλαίην με συνέστιον, iii. 115; Philostratus *Vita Apollon.* 49; *Vita Sophist.* 212, εἰ τις τὸν Ἀθηναῖον φεύγοντα δέξοιτο; 227, ὡς ἀνοίξαι πεῖσαι τὰς οἰκίας καὶ δέξασθαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους; *Epist.* 346, τοὺς ὄρνις αἱ καλαὶ δέχονται πλανάται μεθιστάμεναι καὶ μετοικοῦντα οὕτω κάγγω σε ὑπεδεξάμην; 357, ἔδέξαντο καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι Δῆμητραν φεύγουσαν. In the description of a picture in Philostratus (*Imag.* 389) the fugitives are sailing to Asia: ἀπὸ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐς τὴν Ἀσίαν δέχεται δὲ αὐτὸς οἰκία μάλα ἡδεῖα. Cf. Hesych. *Miles.* 29, Εὐκλειόης Πλάτωνα καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς φιλοσόφους ἔδέξαντο, δείσαντας τὴν ὡμότητα τῶν τυράννων; Dion. Hal. *Antiq. Rom.* i. 12, Λιγυστική τε γῆ σε δέξεται (from Sophocles); Moschus i. 158, Κρήτη δέ σε δέξεται; Lycophron 1021, Κρῆθις συνοίκους δέξεται.

I have confined myself to citations from later Greek writers because a reference to some index will furnish examples from the early literature. Cf., however, Soph. *El.* 160 ff., ὃν ἀ κλεινὰ | γὰ ποτε Μυκηναίων | δέξεται (*Orestes*); Aesch. *Suppl.* 219; Ar. *Av.* 1708; Eur. *Alc.* 855.

That δέχεσθαι is often used in the sense scholars would assign the word here is well known, but mostly in conjunction with *τάφος* (or *γῆ*, *νῆσος*, *ὅρος*), and almost always with *θανόντα* or an equivalent. Cf. Eur. *I. T.* 625. Diodorus Siculus quotes the verse (xx. 14. 6) and supplies the information: ἦν δὲ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀνδρὶς Κρόνου χαλκούς, ἐκτετακὼς τὰς χεῖρας ὑπτίας ἐγκεκλιμένας ἐπὶ τῆν γῆν, ὥστε τὸν ἐπιτεθέντα τῶν παῖδων ἀποκυλίεσθαι καὶ πίπτειν εἰς τι χάσμα πλῆρες πυρός (hence the appropriateness of δέχεσθαι). Cf. Lycophron 805 f., Πέργη δέ μιν θανόντα Τυρσηνῶν ὄρος | ἐν Γορτυναίᾳ δέξεται πεφλεγμένον. But the important fact for us to observe is that in the vast

majority of cases an entirely different verb is used; e. g., Aristotle, *Frag. Hist.* 640, 8. Τεῦκρον ἀποφθίμενον γῆ Σαλαμῖς κατέχει; 9. 10, Νέσωρα . . . γῆς θανόντα | γῆ κατέχει; 17, ἔχε γαῖα; 22, κρύπτει; 45, κεύθει.

J. E. HARRY

CINCINNATI, April 4, 1906

REJOINDER

My judgment upon Mr. Harry's interpretation of *Prom.* 860 was little more than "not proved;" and I am the less disposed to defend Wecklein's view at length because the ground now taken by Mr. Harry is not the same as that taken in his edition. His express rejection of Wecklein's examples (*Soph. Tr.* 803, *Eur. Hel.* 58) certainly led me to think that he found a difficulty in the construction of *δαμέντων*, especially since he did not then raise the question of the usage of *δέξεται*; now he bases his interpretation largely on that word. Some readers will doubtless be convinced by his argument. Others may be obstinate enough to think, with me, that Wecklein's position is not yet proved untenable. I can not accept the assertion that "the idea of receiving into one's home is inseparably connected with *δέχεσθαι* in all periods of the literature," in view of the well-known use in the sense of "meet the attack" of an enemy, which is as old as Homer and is frequent in Xenophon. But, granting due weight to Mr. Harry's examples, the familiar conception of the last resting-place as "the long home," the house of Hades *πολυδέκτης* (cf. *Prom.* 153 and Mr. Harry's note), would make Wecklein's interpretation of the verb at least defensible.

To touch upon another objection, is not "*θανόντα* or an equivalent" at least indicated in *δαμέντων*? If so, by Mr. Harry's own showing, the "traditional" interpretation of *δέξεται* is possible here. The only other important question, I believe, is: Who are more naturally understood as the object of *δέξεται*? Upon this point I have no wish to dogmatize, and, as there is no space for a full discussion, I merely submit that Wecklein's view is not finally disposed of by Mr. Harry's arguments.

CAMPBELL BONNER

NASHVILLE, TENN.

[This emphasis on the idea of shelter in *δέξεται* lends a fine meaning to *δέξεται* [*αὐτούς*]: "Pelasgia shall receive them (the pursuers) into its shelter with woman-deed of murder, in that they are laid low in death by night-waking boldness."—A. F.]

Reports from the Classical Field

It is the purpose of this department to keep the readers of the *Journal* informed of events and undertakings in the classical field, and to make them familiar with the varying conditions under which classical work is being done, and with the aims and experiences of those who are in one way or another endeavoring to increase its effectiveness. The success of the department will naturally depend to a great extent on the co-operation of the individual readers themselves. Every one interested in the *Journal* and in what it is trying to do is therefore cordially invited to report anything of interest that may come to his notice. Inquiries and suggestions will also be useful in directing the attention of the editor to things which may otherwise escape their notice. Communications should be addressed to J. J. Schlicher, 1811 N. Eighth Street, Terre Haute, Ind.

The New England Classical Association.—A meeting of something over a hundred classical teachers was held at Springfield, Mass., April 6 and 7, which resulted in the formation of a classical association for the New England states. A bulletin containing an account of the organization and an abstract of the papers read was sent to those in attendance and to others who have signified their intention of becoming members. Professor C. D. Adams, of Dartmouth College, was elected president, Professor G. E. Howes, of Williams College, secretary.

The first meeting, on Friday evening, was given to a discussion of the situation, and the desirability of forming an association, and to an account by Professor Heidel, formerly of Iowa College, of the first meeting of the Association of the Middle West and South at Chicago a year ago.

On Saturday the following papers were read: "Some Impressions of Knossos and King Minos' Time" (Professor Manatt, Brown University), "The Change of Emphasis in Classical Teaching" (Mr. Reed, Cambridge); "The Classical Teacher's Working Library" (Professor Forbes, Andover); "The Efficient Teaching of Latin Prose" (Principal Whiting, Greenfield); "Recent Excavations in the Roman Forum" (Professor Burton, Dartmouth College), "The Classics as a Means of Training in English" (Professor Walton, Wellesley College); "The Place of Geography and Biography in Elementary History" (Professor Higley, Groton School).

The American School of Classical Studies in Rome.—The current year at the American School in Rome has been a prosperous one. At the opening in October eighteen students enrolled, but later arrivals soon swelled the number to twenty-five, who represent no less than seventeen American colleges and universities: Bryn Mawr, Chicago, Grinnell, Harvard, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Pomona, Radcliffe, Smith, Swarthmore, Union (Kentucky), Vassar, Wellesley, Williams, and Yale. Especially encouraging is the

fact that the number of those who return for a second year or more is steadily increasing, eight students being in attendance this year who have been members of the school in at least one previous year. Such continuous or repeated residence is greatly to be desired, as one must spend the greater part of his first year in Rome in getting a general acquaintance with the topography of the city, contents of museums, important sites in Latium, etc. Mr. A. M. Harmon (Williams College, 1902) holds the school fellowship for the second time; the Carnegie fellowships are held by Miss S. H. Ballou (University of Chicago, 1897), now resident in her third year, and by Mr. A. W. Van Buren (Yale University, 1900), resident in his fourth year.

Since Professor Carter has remained for a second year, the school has been able to offer a larger variety of instruction than usual. The director lectured on the topography of Rome during the autumn; since Christmas he has been giving a course on the sculpture in the museums. Professor Moore conducted a course in palaeography for ten weeks, and then began a course on the "Interpretation of Inscriptions;" in December and January he also lectured once a week on "Roman Private Life" as illustrated by the monuments. Professor Carter has continued his work of last year in a course on "Roman Religion under the Empire," and during the latter part of the year has lectured on the "Renaissance of Classical Studies;" while Mr. DeCou has lectured on archaeology throughout the year. During the autumn Mr. Van Buren conducted a number of Saturday excursions to important sites in Latium, which were of great value to all who took part in them. Beginning on February 15, Professor Venturi, of the University of Rome, gave a course of ten lectures on the "Painting of the Trecento." In March the school broke up as usual to allow excursions to Greece and elsewhere by those who wished to travel; early in May the members reassembled for Dr. Mau's lectures at Pompeii.

The Classical Seminars, 1906-7.—For the convenience of students intending to do graduate work next year, the following list of seminars is printed:

Bryn Mawr College: Greek Orators (Sanders); Homeric Question (France); Roman Elegy (Wheeler); Roman History from the Sources (Frank); Archaeology (Ransom).

Columbia: Demosthenes, Private Orations (Perry); Plautus (Knapp).

De Pauw University: Latin Satire (Post).

George Washington University: Attic Orators, Cicero (Carroll and Smith).

Harvard University: Aeschylus (Smyth), Suetonius (Howard).

Johns Hopkins University: Aristophanes (Gildersleeve); Roman Drama, especially Plautus and Terence (Smith); Pausanias (Robinson).

Leland Stanford Jr. University: Attic Tragedy (Murray); Vergil *Aeneid* (Fairclough).

Northwestern University: Greek Dramatic Poetry (Scott); Tacitus (Bonbright); Cicero's Orations (Long).

Tulane University: Critical Study of the Olympian and Pythian Odes (Miller); Roman Comedy (Dillard).

University of California: Critical Studies in Homer (Clapp); Ovid (Richardson); Archaeology (O'Connor).

University of Chicago: Stoicism and Epicureanism in Ancient Literature and Life (Shorey); Colloquial Latin (Abbott).

University of Michigan: Sophocles (D'Ooge); Juvenal and Persius (Kelsey).

University of Pennsylvania: Martial, proseminar (McDaniel); Corpus Caesarianum (Rolfe).

University of Texas: Critical Study of Ennius and Vergil (Fay).

University of Wisconsin: Sophocles (Smith); Plautus (Slaughter).

Yale University: Greek History (Perrin); Horace *Epistles* (Peck).

Students and Instructors Abroad Next Year.—*Athens*: Sarah A. Babbitt, fellow; K. K. Smith, fellow; Professor J. H. Wright (Harvard), professor in the school. *Rome*: Professor J. L. Moore (Vassar); Professor H. L. Wilson (Johns Hopkins), professor in the school. *Italy*: Professor M. H. Morgan (Harvard). *Berlin*: Robert H. Webb (University of Virginia); Mary L. Cady (Bryn Mawr, European fellow); W. E. Clark (Harvard). *Leipzig*: Professor R. W. Husband (Dartmouth). *Germany*: Emily L. Shields (Bryn Mawr, senior fellow). *Oxford*: Roy K. Hock (Williams); Ralph C. Many (Queens College). Professor W. S. Ferguson (University of California) will go abroad to study inscriptions.

The New Director of the School at Athens.—Mr. Bert Hodge Hill, who enters upon the duties of this office in the fall, was born at Bristol, Vt., in 1874, graduated from the University of Vermont in 1895, was principal of a high school, 1895-98, studied at Columbia, 1898-1900, and obtained the degree A.M. there in the latter year. That same year he went to Athens as Drisler fellow, and during the two following years held a fellowship of the school. Since 1903 he has been assistant curator of classical antiquities in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

Fellows in the School at Rome, 1906-7.—Carnegie research fellowships: Austin M. Harmon, Esther B. Van Deman; fellowship in classical archaeology: Ralph V. Magoffin; fellowship in Christian archaeology: Clark D. Lamberton; fellowship in mediaeval and Renaissance studies: Philip J. Gentner.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.—Work has not been hampered in the least by the earthquake. The working part of the institution is injured very slightly, and will be repaired in time for the opening of the fall semester. The buildings ruined were mainly buildings in course of construction that would not have been needed for some time to come.

Recent Changes.—*Johns Hopkins University*: The three-year undergraduate course is to be extended to four years, and four years each are to be given to Latin and Greek. Especial attention will be devoted to prose composition, and Latin essays will be required. Another feature will be the private reading of certain works in addition to those read in the class. *University of Virginia*: A system of preceptorial instruction has been adopted. For each

class there is one instructor, who meets the class one hour corresponding to each hour of regular lecture work. *Tulane University*: A teaching fellow has been appointed in Latin, and one in Greek. *University of Kentucky*: Virgil will hereafter be considered preparatory instead of college work. *Bryn Mawr*: A new scholarship in the department of archaeology. *Woman's College (Baltimore)*: Latin has been made a free elective. *California*: A state law requires that candidates for high-school teacher's certificates shall have spent a full year in graduate work. *Equipment*: Many institutions, among them a number of the smaller colleges, report substantial additions to their stock of illustrative material, photographs, maps, casts, slides, etc.

University of Michigan.—Arthur Fairbanks, professor of Greek literature and archaeology in the State University of Iowa, has accepted an appointment as professor of the Greek language and Greek archaeology in this institution. Professor Fairbanks was graduated at Dartmouth College (A.B. 1886) and received the doctor's degree at Freiburg i. B. (1890). His work at Michigan next year will include courses in Greek art, mythology and religion, and political antiquities.

Doctor's Dissertations in the Classics, 1900-1905.—The lists given below include all persons who received the degree Ph.D. from American universities in Greek, Latin, and closely allied subjects, together with the titles of their dissertations, so far as it was possible to obtain this information by correspondence. The school-year 1900-1901, as the first in the century, was chosen as a convenient starting-point, and it is the intention of the *Journal* to publish similar lists from year to year hereafter, so that its files may finally contain a complete list of the classical dissertations written in this country.

Boston University—

1. Kimball, E. A., "The Nine Muses of Greek Lyric Poetry" ('05).
2. Harrop, A. H., "De Vergilii Theocritum imitandi modo" ('05).
3. Rice, A. H., "The Roman Senate" ('05).

Brown University—

4. Keyes, A. H., "Andokides and the Mutilation of the Hermae at Athens in 415 B. C." ('01).

Catholic University of America—

5. Oswald, M. M. F., "The Use of the Prepositions in Apollonius Rhodius, Compared with Their Use in Homer" (publ. Notre Dame Univ. Press, '04).
6. Trahey, J. J., "De sermone Ennodiano, Hieronymi sermone in comparationem adhibito" (publ. Notre Dame Univ. Press, '05).

Columbia University—

7. Hirst, Gertrude Mary, "The Cults of Olbia" ('01, publ. *J. H. S.* XXII. 245-67, and XXIII. 24-53).
8. Ball, Allan Perley, "The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Seneca" ('02, publ., Col. Univ. Press). ?

9. Macurdy, Grace Harriet, "The Chronology of the Extant Plays of Euripides" ('03, publ., New Era Press, Lancaster, Pa.).
10. Pickhardt, Ernest W. S., "De Aeschyli Imaginibus" ('04, to be publ.).
11. Thallon, Ida Carleton, "Lycosura and Damophon" ('05, to be publ. in *Am. Jour. Arch.*, '06).

Cornell University—

12. Neville, K. P. R., "The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Latin" (publ. in *Corn. Stud. in Class. Phil.* XV).
13. Babcock, C. L., "An Investigation regarding the Use of the Genitive and Accusative with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting" (publ. *ibid.* XIV).
14. Newton, H. C., "The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus" (publ. *ibid.* XVI).
15. Jeffords, C. R., "The Origin and Development of the Subordinating Functions of the Particle *dum*" ('04).
16. MacRae, D. A., "The Life of Sophocles, from the Sources" ('05).
17. Powell, B., "Erichthonius and the Three Daughters of Cecrops: A Study in Mythology" ('05, publ. *ibid.* XVII).
18. Smith, Lilian S., "On the Adnominal Genitive in Tacitus" ('05).
19. Throop, G. R., "A New Manuscript of Cicero's *De senectute*" ('05).

Harvard University—

20. Baker, W. W., "De comicis Graecis litterarum iudicibus" ('01, publ. *H. S.* XV. 121-240).
21. Cole, C. N., "De Vergilio Catulli imitatore" ('01).
22. Edmiston, H., "Aristotelis Poeticam quibus modis scriptores aetate inferiores prave interpretati sint quaeritur" ('01).
23. Jackson, C. N., "Quas partes equi habebant in religionibus Graecorum" ('01).
24. Prescott, H. W., "De Daphnide commentatio" ('01, publ. *H. S.* X. 121-40).
25. Cameron, D., "Quae in Festi sententiis et oratione a Paulo mutata sint quaeritur" ('02).
26. Clark, F. L., "Qua ratione Platonis laudandi usus sit Clemens Alexandrinus quaeritur" ('02).
27. Hewitt, J. W., "De rationibus Iovem Graecum placandi capitula" ('02).
28. Reichle, L., "De *ab de ex* praepositionum in inscriptionibus usu" ('02).
29. Watson, J. C., "De scaenarum titulis imaginibusque personarum Terentianis in codicibus pictis" ('02, publ. *H. S.* XIV. 55-172).
30. Woodman, W. P., "De arte piscandi apud antiquos Graecos" ('02).
31. Anderson, A. R., "De Plauti diphthongi *ei* usu quaestiones" ('03).
32. Ballentine, F. G., "De nympharum cultu quaestiones selectae" ('03, publ. *H. S.* XV. 77-119).
33. Cary, E., "De Aristophanis *Avium* apud Suidam reliquiis" ('03).

34. Rankin, E. M., "Quas partes ei qui Μάγειροι vocantur in vita cotidiana Graecorum egerint quaeritur" ('03).
35. Tonks, O. S., "Brygos" ('03, publ. *Mem. Amer. Acad.*, 1904).
36. Brackett, H. D., "De enuntiationum temporalium apud Herodotum usu atque ratione commentatio" ('04, publ. *Mem. Amer. Acad.*, 1905).
37. Cleasby, H. L., "De Seneca Tragico Ovidi imitatore" ('04).
38. Hatch, W. H. P., "De verborum ἀλιτήριοι, ἀλιτρόι, ἀράοι, ἐνθύμιοι, παλαιμάνοι, προστρέπωνοι usu apud scriptores Graecos usque ad annum CCC ante Christum natum" ('04).
39. Crosby, H. L., "De comicorum Graecorum temporibus quaeritur" ('05).
40. Pease, A. S., "De Sancti Hieronymi commentariolis tractatibusque in Psalmos quaestiones variae" ('05).
41. Petersson, T., "De epigrammatis Iuliani Aegyptii" ('05).
42. Randolph, C. B., "De mandragora" ('05, publ. *Mem. Amer. Acad.*, 1905).

Johns Hopkins University—

43. Archibald, H. T., "The Literary Use of the Fable by the Greeks and Romans" ('01, to be publ.).
44. Daniel, W. B., "A Comparative Study of *quin* and *quominus* in the Latin Language" ('01, to be publ.).
45. Guernsey, R., "The Greek Views of the Influence of Environment upon Men and Animals" ('01, to be publ.).
46. Berg, G. O., "Metaphor and Comparison in the Dialogues of Plato" (publ. Berlin, Mayer and Müller, '04).
47. Edwards, P. H., "The Poetic Element in the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace" (Part I publ., Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., '05).
48. Jones, T. M., "Case Construction of *similis* and its Compounds" (publ. Baltimore, Friedenwald Co., '03).
49. Savage, C. A., "The Athenian Family: A Legal and Sociological Study Based Chiefly on the Orators" ('03, to be publ.).
50. Sanders, H. N., "The Cynegeticus of Xenophon" ('03, publ. Baltimore).
51. Canter, H. V., "The Infinitive Construction in Livy" ('04, to be publ.).
52. Crumley, J. J., "On the Social Standing of Freedmen as Indicated in the Latin Writers; with a Discussion of the Words *libertus* and *libertinus*" ('04, to be publ.).
53. Mood, J. R., "Some Peculiar Usages of the Latin Verb *venire*" ('04, to be publ.).
54. Raney, M. L., "The Case-Regimen of the Verbs of Hearing in Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes" ('04, to be publ.).
55. Shear, T. L., "The Influence of Plato on St. Basil" ('04, to be publ.).
56. Hope, E. W., "The Language of Parody: A Study in the Diction of Aristophanes" ('05, to be publ.).
57. Leutner, W. G., "The Article in Theocritus" ('05, to be publ.).

58. McWhorter, A. W., "The Effect of Person on Mood: A Study Based on the Ambiguous Form of Question of the *τι ποιήσω*; Type in Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides" ('05, to be publ.).
59. Wise, B. A., "The Influence of Statius upon Chaucer" ('05, to be publ.).

Leland Stanford Jr. University—

60. Elmore, J., "The Syntax of Certain Latin Verbs of Desire in the Literature of the Republic" (publ. Berlin, L. Simion, '01).

New York University—

61. Fisher, W. W., "A Comparison of the Leading God-Ideas of Aeschylus and Sophocles" ('00, privately printed).
62. Lumley, Eleanor P., "On Plautus and Ben Jonson" ('00, privately printed).
63. Kupfer, Lillian, "Greek Foreshadowings of Modern Metaphysical and Epistemological Thought" ('01, privately printed).
64. Melville, J., "On the Roman Laws *de ambitu*" ('01).
65. Bostroem, E., "De Graecis verbis apud Plautum inventis" ('02, privately printed).
66. Gottlieb, J., "On the Problem of Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Ars ad Herennium*" ('04, to be publ.).
67. Senftner, A. on the same subject, ('04, to be publ.).
68. Daniells, E. D., "Epic Art and Poetical Language in Statius" ('05, to be publ.).
69. Delamarre, L., "Tacite et la littérature française" ('05, to be publ.).

Princeton University—

70. Robinson, C. A., "The Figures and Tropes in Isaeus" ('01, privately printed).

University of Chicago—

71. Harris, Mary Belle, "The Lyric of Kalidasa; its Form and Subject-Matter" ('00, to be publ.).
72. Schlicher, J. J., "The Origin of Rhythrical Verse in Late Latin" ('00, privately printed).
73. Comparette, Thomas Louis, "The Inscriptional Hexameters" ('01, to be publ.).
74. Millerd, Clara, "Aristotle's Conception of Pre-Socratic Philosophy" ('01, to be publ.).
75. Owen, William Bishop, "The Customs and Laws of Naturalization at Athens" ('01, to be publ.).
76. Tibbets, William Frank, "The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin" ('01, to be publ.).
77. Bechtel, E. A., "Sanctae Silviae Peregrinatio: The Text and a Study of the Latinity" (publ. *Univ. of Chic. Stud. in Class. Phil.* IV, '02).

78. Hellems, F. B. R., "Lex de Imperio Vespasiani: A Consideration of Some of the Constitutional Aspects of the Principate at Rome" (publ. Chicago, Scott, Foresman & Co., '02).
79. Sturtevant, E. H., "Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin *io*- and *ia*- Stems, and of *deus*, *is*, and *idem*" (publ. Chicago, Scott, Foresman & Co., '02).
80. Swearingen, George Crawford, "A Study in the Manuscripts of Horace" ('02, to be publ.).
81. Shipley, F. W., "A Palaeographical Study of an Unused MS of Livy, Cod. Regin. 762" (publ. *Am. Journ. Arch.* VII, '03).
82. Flickinger, R. C., "Plutarch as a Source of Information on the Greek Theater" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '04.).
83. Frank, T., "The Attraction of Mood in Early Latin" (privately printed, '04).
84. Kellermann, Ivy, "On the Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects" ('04, privately printed).
85. Paschal, G. W., "A Study of Quintus of Smyrna" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '04).
86. Robinson, D. M., "Ancient Sinope: An Historical Account, with An Appendix of Sinopean Inscriptions and a Prosopographia Sinopensis" ('04, publ. *Am. Journ. Arch.* IX, '05).
87. Bondurant, Bernard Camillus, "Decimus Brutus" ('05, to be publ.).
88. Bonner, R. J., "Evidence in Athenian Courts" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
89. Dignan, F. W., "The Idle Actor in Aeschylus (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
90. Gordis, W. S., "The Estimates of Moral Values Expressed in Cicero's Letters" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
91. Gunnerson, W. C., "The History of *u*-Stems in Greek" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
92. Kennedy, Mary Jackson, "Characterization in Tacitus and Ammianus" ('05, to be publ.).
93. Misener, Geneva, "The Particle *γαρ* in Greek" (privately printed, '05).
94. Peaks, Mary B., "The General Civil and Military Administration of Noricum and Raetia" ('05, to be publ.).
95. Ransom, Caroline L., "Studies in Ancient Furniture: Couches and Beds of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
96. Van Hook, LaR., "The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism" (publ. Univ. of Chic. Press, '05).
- University of Cincinnati—
97. Bishop, J. R., "Prolepsis in the Attic Orators" ('03).
98. King, F. A., "Ποικιλτα in Plato" ('04).

University of Colorado—

99. Derham, M. G., "Signa and Less Usual Cognomina in Latin Inscriptions" ('04, to be publ.).

University of Michigan—

100. Elden, W. S., "The Conditional Period in the Writings of Q. Horatius Flaccus" ('00, privately printed).

101. Jeffers, S. A., "The Philosophical Vocabulary of Lucretius" ('00, soon to be publ.).

102. Meader, C. L., "A Semasiological Study of the Pronouns *hic* and *iste*" (publ. in *The Latin Pronouns is, hic, ille, ipse*, New York, Macmillan Co., '01).

103. Hadzsits, G. D., "A Study of Greek Ethics in the Second Century of the Christian Era: Plutarch" (publ. Univ. of Cincin. Press, '02).

104. Hadzsits, W. D., "The Apotheosis of the Roman Emperors" ('02, to be publ.).

105. Swan, F. T., "The Adjectives Used as Substantives by Lucretius" ('03, to be publ.).

106. Allen, G. H., "Centurions as Substitute Commanders" (publ. *Univ. of Mich. Stud.*, Hum. Ser., Vol. I. 333-82).

107. Drake, J. H., "The Principales of the Early Empire" (publ. *Univ. of Mich. Stud.*, Hum. Ser., Vol. I. 261-332).

108. Stuart, D. R., "The Attitude of Dio Cassius toward Epigraphic Sources" (publ. *Univ. of Mich. Stud.*, Hum. Ser., Vol. I. 101-47).

109. Armstrong, H. H., "The Autobiographical Element in Latin Inscriptions" ('05, to be publ.).

University of Minnesota—

110. Lantz, C., "Development of Plot and Character in the Plays of Terence" ('03).

University of Pennsylvania—

111. Byrne, L., "Seneca's Philosophy of Life: His Tragedies Compared with His Prose" ('01, privately printed).

112. Vlachos, N. P., "The Subject of Sophocles' *Antigone*" ('01, privately printed).

113. Kent, R. G., "A History of Thessaly from the Earliest Historical Times to the Accession of Philip V of Macedonia, or from about 600 to 220 B. C." ('03, privately printed).

114. Lowther, H. S., "The Syntax of Martial" ('04, to be privately printed).

115. Meeter, Henrietta J., "The Artists of Pergamus" ('04).

116. Mendelsohn, C. J., "The Name-Play in Plautus" ('04, to be publ. in *Penn. Stud. in Class. Phil.*).

117. Downer, J. W., "Figurative Language in the *Satires* of Petronius" ('05).

University of Virginia—

118. Long, C. M., "Indicative Apodoses with Subjunctive Protases in the Unreal Conditional Sentences of Livy and Tacitus" ('01, privately printed).

- 119. McCartney, T. B., "On Pronouns in *oratio obliqua* and Kindred Constructions" ('02, privately printed).
- 120. Sears, O. B., "On Latin Conditional Sentences of Unreality in Indirect Discourse Proper" ('02, privately printed).

University of Wisconsin—

- 121. Showerman, G., "The Great Mother of the Gods" (publ. *Univ. of Wis. Bull.*, '01).
- 122. Pitman, Annie M., "The Treatment of Nature in the Poetry of the Roman Empire during the Augustan Age" ('03, to be publ. in *Univ. of Wis. Bull.*).
- 123. McClernan, Marie, "The Periphrases in Thucydides" ('04, to be publ. in *Univ. of Wis. Bull.*).
- 124. O'Connor, C. J., "The Graecostasis of the Roman Forum and its Vicinity" (publ. in *Univ. of Wis. Bull.*, '04).
- 125. Smiley, C. N., "Latinitas: Concerning the Stoic Theory of Style" ('05, to be publ. in *Univ. of Wis. Bull.*).

Yale University—

- 126. Hume, R. E., "A Translation of the Principal Upanishads" ('01).
- 127. Barbour, Amy L., "Tryphiodorus: His Relation to other Epics in Form and Vocabulary" ('02).
- 128. Brubacher, A. R., "Parataxis in Herodotus" ('02).
- 129. Root, R. K., "Classical Mythology in Shakespeare" ('02, publ.).
- 130. Abbe, Elizabeth F., "Entrances in Greek Tragedy" ('03).
- 131. Brown, L. D., "A Study of the Case Construction of Words of Time" ('03, publ.).
- 132. Bunnell, F. S., "Notes on the Vocabulary of Apollonius Rhodius as Compared with That of Homer" ('03).
- 133. Clark, C. U., "The Text Tradition of Ammianus Marcellinus" ('03, publ.).
- 134. Sledd, A., "Sentence Connection in the Letters of Pliny" ('03).
- 135. Wright, H. B., "A Historical and Critical Study of the Literary Evidence for the Battle of Plataea" ('03, publ.).
- 136. Beggs, Gertrude H., "The Adnominal Genitive in Lysias" ('04).
- 137. Weller, C. H., "The Pre-Periclean Propylon on the Acropolis at Athens" ('04, publ.).
- 138. Welles, Mary C., "The Appropriation and Latent Criticism of Herodotus in Thucydides" ('04).
- 139. Wetmore, M. N., "The Plan and Scope of a Vergil Lexicon with Specimen Articles" ('04).
- 140. Bassett, S. E., "The Bucolic Diaeresis in Homer" ('05).

Book Reviews

The Religion of Numa and Other Essays on the Religion of Ancient Rome. By JESSE BENEDICT CARTER. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906. Pp. viii + 189. \$1.00.

In the five essays on (1) "The Religion of Numa," (2) "The Reorganization of Servius," (3) "The Coming of the Sibyl," (4) "The Decline of Faith," and (5) "The Augustan Renaissance," Professor Carter "tries to tell the story of the religious life of the Romans from the time when their history begins for us until the close of the reign of Augustus." He draws both inspiration and material largely from Wissowa, to whom he confesses himself "almost inestimably indebted;" and his work may best be described as an amplification, not without more originality and independence than the author's modest disclaimer might lead us to believe, of that distinguished scholar's historical outline of Roman religion in his *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Part I). It will consequently be of greatest interest and profit to those who have already approached the subject through Wissowa or his pupil Aust (*Religion der Römer*, 1899). That it will appeal mainly to an audience of specialists is no fault of the author; only students of the classics, ancient history, and religion are prepared to receive the word of Roman religion.

The virtues of Professor Carter's book are admirable clearness and soberness of presentation, and a degree of scholarship which does honor to himself and his master; and it is none the worse for an occasional bubble of humor which rises from the depths and bursts on the sea of facts. As a detail of method, his relegation of references to the index, where they find place after the appropriate word, is especially commendable in a work of this kind.

One or two details may be noted. The old confusion of the Regia with the Domus Publica as the residence of the Pontifex Maximus is continued (p. 177; see Platner, *Topography and Monuments*, for references). It seems hardly credible that the altar in the niche before the temple of Divus Julius was walled in by the Christians for the sole motive of removing an eyesore (p. 173); a structural motive would be more natural; why so much trouble to cover up that which might be removed with comparative ease? It seems to us, too, that Professor Carter, following the fashion, places too much emphasis upon the "moral purpose" of the Augustan poets (pp. 151 ff.). To insist too much on the made-to-order quality of Augustan poetry is to discredit its art. As to moral *effect*, no one would question the assertion that the *Aeneid* exercised a powerful influence; but the statement that the *Georgics*, those "glowing pictures of farm life, did quite as much to carry out the emperor's plans as the *Aeneid* later," is

hardly to be taken seriously by those who have even a superficial acquaintance with the conditions upon which agriculture is based.

In two respects Professor Carter's book is defective. If he is not scant in his treatment of the oriental religions, he is at least unsympathetic. His characterization of them as superstitions, qualified though it is, leaves something of a false impression. Here again he is following the fashion. But there was another side to these religions, and we are much more inclined to agree with Renan that they had "something deeper in them than those of Greece and Rome; they addressed themselves more fully to the religious sentiment." In spite of their theatrical nature and the abuses with which they are charged, there was something warmly human in them by reason of which they contributed toward making straight the way of Christianity. There is less excuse for the omission of a more intimate account of the private side of Roman religion, for it was this which was after all the real religion of the Roman people. By neglecting these two aspects of the subject, the author has come short of investing his work with the full human interest of which it is capable. It might better be called "Essays on the *State Religion of Ancient Rome*." With all its clearness and excellence of presentation, it leaves the reader cold.

None of these defects, however, is such as seriously to impair the work as a whole; and those who wish a straightforward and useful account of a subject which is somewhat hard to get at will do well to avail themselves of this series of essays.

GRANT SHOWERMAN

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

An Elementary Greek Grammar for Schools. Part I: Accidence.

Part II: Syntax. By JOHN THOMPSON. London: John Murray, 1905. Pp. xii+152, x+58. 3s.

This new grammar, published in conservative England, is the only elementary Greek grammar in the English language that consistently aims at being up to date. The principles and methods of the new school of philology have been followed in the main. While even the proper pronunciation of ξ , θ , ϕ , and χ is insisted upon, we are surprised to find the erroneous $\phi\phi$ laid down as law (p. 4), though the author always writes the correct $\rho\rho$. It must have required no little courage in the author to forsake the traditional order of cases in the paradigms and follow the logical sequence N., V., A., G., D. But the usefulness of his paradigms is greatly impaired by misleading divisions which should represent stem and ending, but do not; e. g., $\tau\alpha\lambda\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\pi\cdot\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$, $\chi\alpha\pi\cdot\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$.

The laws of accent and phonetic change are hidden away in appendices. Only rarely is any reference made to them, as if such side-lights might confuse rather than enlighten the elementary student; e. g., $\theta\pi\ell\acute{\epsilon}$ is said to have two stems, $\theta\pi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\cdot$ and $\tau\pi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}\cdot$; deaspiration is not mentioned, save in the appendix; neither is the law of dropping a dental mute before σ ; as a result, $\phi\hat{\omega}\acute{\epsilon}$, $\phi\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\epsilon}$, etc., must

be classed, unfortunately, as "mixed stems." The effort to keep within the bounds of a strictly elementary book has generally restrained the author from recognizing *f* or *z* in the formation of words or inflection. The result has tended rather to confusion than to clearness in his treatment of stems in *ε* and *υ* and (apparent) diphthongs, and has left a host of "irregularities" unexplained. This shows itself most conspicuously in a long list of "Irregular Verbs," most of which are not in the least irregular.

The Syntax is the weaker portion of the book. Logical explanations of constructions are seldom given. It is mere phenomena of usage that are stated for the pupil to memorize and accept on faith. Those statements, however, have the conspicuous merit, as a rule, of being clear; the pupil will usually know at once what the author means to say. The only serious exception is found in the treatment of conditional sentences. Here Mr. Thompson has clung to the traditional treatment, and the schoolboy will scarcely guess from this grammar that the apodosis of a conditional sentence is an independent construction, but will be led to think that the form of this independent clause is in some way dependent upon the form of the subordinate clause that depends upon it.

Only rarely is a statement misleading, as e. g., when we are told that "impersonal verbs have no subject" (Part II, p. 2), or that *σ* between two vowels is "elided" (pp. 23, 41). Actual errors are rarer still; e. g., "Nouns in *-ινης* are like *πολιτης*" (p. 13); but the vocative is not. "A substantive depending upon another substantive is *always* in the genitive" (Part II, p. 07). The typography is generally accurate, but not attractive. Misprints are few, but they do occur; e. g., *δεῖτα* for *δεῖται* (p. 98), *γχω* (p. 23), *σαύρω* for *σαύρων* (Part II, p. 56).

W. M.

Greek Reader. Vol. I. Adapted, with English Notes, from von WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF's *Griechisches Lesebuch*. By E. C. MARCHANT. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905. \$0.50.

Mr. Marchant feels it necessary in his preface to insert a foil against criticism of the un-Attic Greek the *Reader* contains; but more than one reader of English publication has been open to the same criticism. We know that Krüger, long ago, spoke a word for Arrian in the preface to his edition of that author. Perhaps on this side of the water we do not so much need the semi-apology for Strabo and others. The *Anabasis* is everywhere used among us, and everywhere teachers feel that a fit substitute would be welcome. Good as this book is, it is not likely to oust our old friend, though it may be made use of here or there in the course.

It contains the well-known skit by Dio Chrysostom, "The Hunters;" Arrian's account of the battle between Alexander and Porus; a scrap of Strabo's description of Great Britain; Hiero's Galleon, by Moschion; and Thucydides' tale of Pausanias, and Themistocles, somewhat modified. This is the best selection that could have been made from the original list. The Gnomes, Maxims, etc.,

half a dozen pages of which precede the above, might better have given place to the Aesop which is not used. For instance, the sixth sentence is this: *ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μηδὲ ἀθέλειν.* Perhaps a youngster might not be able to manipulate those negatives offhand so soon. But the book and its original preface say that it is for pupils who are just beginning to read. As classes go the book would fit in at about the third semester's work. There is no way, indeed, whereby selections can be graded in point of difficulty, and the puzzle of a first and second reader must ever remain. If one of those idle Athenians had prepared, and we had left to us, a couple of "*Ἐλληνικά Ἀραγνώσματα [πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν σχολεῖων]*," half the woes of schoolboys and teachers would vanish.

There are twenty-five pages of notes to sixty of text. This makes us think well of the book. The editor says the notes are brief, and he might have added that they hit the mark with a fresh surprise which any boy can appreciate. For American use it is a drawback that the notes have no grammatical references, and syntax is scantily treated. There is no vocabulary, which is a notable lack in a first reader. It should be a "handy book," but can not be quite so if one must thumb a separate lexicon.

Nevertheless, the book, as it is, is well worth using with young classes, and its freshness, and total unlikeness to the humdrum of Xenophon, may offset its possible disadvantages. It is beautifully got up, and its editing what we expect from Mr. Marchant.

CHARLES M. MOSS

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The Classics and Modern Training. By SIDNEY G. ASHMORE.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905. \$1.35.

Mr. Ashmore has succeeded in giving us an interesting book upon a subject which at first thought inevitably suggests old straw threshed over. In this little volume will be found, stated in a new way, part of the claim by which classical studies must stand or fall. The chapter on "Our Classical Inheritance" gives in detail or by suggestion the story of how the classics came to Europe and renewed a vanishing civilization. Pages 58 and 59 will give stimulus to Latin and Greek teachers, and friends of classical learning will be encouraged in the belief that it is one of the strongholds of our culture.

The question whether the work of textual criticism is worth the untiring effort which has been devoted to it, Mr. Ashmore answers without hesitation. Politian, Bentley, Scaliger, Hermann, and a host of others are rightly honored for having performed a peculiar service to the world—a service which constitutes no small part of what has been done in the last five hundred years to keep our western world out of the slough of so-called practical interests. The huge labor expended on the decipherment of manuscripts, and on the restoration and emendation of classical texts, has not been thrown away, like tread-mill work against the friction of the axle; the minds developed in just this effort have profoundly

influenced the thinking world of their time. Who shall say that just the incisive quality that they possessed could have been developed by any other process at hand? The obvious and unquestioned result of their labor is a classical literature cleverly restored from chaos to beautiful order; these are the men who have given Europe "the staple of its intellectual education."

But it is in the chapter on "Greek Tragedy and Comedy" that Mr. Ashmore proves himself the exemplar that vindicates his plea for classical culture as embodying "intrinsic beauty and artistic excellence." There have been a few times in the history of the world when *κατὰ μοῖραν* almost perfect dramatic literature has been born. Greece at the time of the Persian wars gave us Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; England, in a period of great national awakening, gave us Shakespeare.

A certain recrudescence of interest in the antiquities of Greece and Rome has come through the popularizing of archaeological knowledge, especially that pertaining to recent finds. Mr. Ashmore cleverly contrasts philology and archaeology as spheres of effort and sources of interest. Just now archaeology seems to have the more brilliant rôle.

Athens, "the eye of Greece, mother of arts and eloquence," must ever be the theme of the Hellenist and the Mecca of his travels. Mr. Ashmore's description of modern Athens will interest all students of the classics. A plea for the continuance of interest in the Olympic games and for Athens as their permanent location closes the volume.

J. REMSEN BISHOP

EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL
Detroit

(The editors of the *Classical Journal* were requested by several persons interested in the first chapter of Mr. Ashmore's book ("A Plea for the Classics in Our Schools") to reprint this chapter in the *Journal*. This plan did not seem feasible, but at our request the publishers have issued the chapter separately at low price. Several hundred copies of it have been distributed among the classical teachers in Wisconsin and elsewhere. We wish to add to the above review a notice of the cogent plea for the classics which Mr. Ashmore makes in this essay. After pointing out the supreme importance of the study of language in education, in that such study develops concepts and teaches the child to bring them into relation, Mr. Ashmore discusses the relative value of the different languages in producing this result. English he places first; Latin, second. Leaving on one side the value of ancient literature and the detailed study of grammar as matters which do not directly concern the child, though they are of supreme importance in his later mental development, he points out "two qualities at least in which Latin surpasses other tongues as a desirable instrument in early training, viz., a greater proportion of words standing for concrete things and affording the best material for practice in forming concepts, and . . . a ruling tendency to logical order in the arrangement of words in a sentence." The classical teacher does not need to be taught the importance of his subject, but the character of his teaching might often be improved by the careful study of the argument in this pamphlet.—ED.)

Selections from Livy. Edited, with Notes and Introduction, by HARRY EDWIN BURTON. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 375. \$1.50.

The special feature of this edition lies, not in its annotations—though these are creditable—but in presenting selections from no fewer than twenty of the extant books of Livy. The reviewer is in complete sympathy with the general idea of giving annotated selections in order that the college student may become acquainted with other portions of Livy than are represented in the stereotyped i, xxi, xxii. These three books themselves are only selections, and possess no special sanctity that should impose their less interesting chapters on an editor, or should exclude other selections that represent just as well, or better, the genius and versatility of the historian. Book i, it is true, forms a fairly complete whole, treated in a masterly way, but the student is ordinarily left without evidence, from the direct sources, of further changes that entered into the development of Rome as a world power. If Rome's real greatness is nowhere better exemplified than in the spirit of her men of the first half of the Republic—and this seems to be a reasonable contention—then judicious selections from Livy's history of that period are easily justified. Again, if one views the war with Hannibal in its whole aspect, books xxi and xxii do not give so satisfactory a knowledge of the memorable struggle as do selections from the whole period, showing Roman successes as well as defeats, the defection or capture of important cities, their recapture, the carrying of the war into Africa, the recall of Hannibal by his unsympathetic government, and his ultimate fate. So long as the larger units of Livy's work are thus kept in mind, the obvious danger of destroying unity by making selections may be happily averted. Professor Burton, however, does not always escape this danger, chiefly because he has attempted to represent every decade. The selections from the later books are more fragmentary than is necessary, and their appearance has caused some rather important omissions elsewhere. The selections from book i merely illustrate one side—the founding of Rome, the deification of Romulus, the fight of the Horatii and the Curiatii—without any account of the regal administrations. A judicious amount of this material would have given more significance to certain later selections, particularly from books ii and iii. Even the legendary side is not represented in the best way to secure student interest, if the exploits of Coelus, Scaevola, and Cincinnatus, or similar characteristic narratives, do not appear.

The selections which have been made are not always skilfully introduced or closed. To illustrate, the story of the Gallic invasion (book v. 35. 3-43. 5) begins with what is really a digression. A more natural beginning, in keeping with the spirit of the passage, is at v. 32. 6-33. 4. The lengthy digression should then, of course, be omitted, and there would follow no break even for the eye to detect between *auctoremque Clusium oppugnandi fuisse* and *Clusini novo bello exterriti* (35. 4). The second selection in book vii might better close at the end of chap. 33 than at the end of 31. Similarly, the close of the first selection

in book ix shows too plainly a desire to save space. The wisdom of including Livy's patriotic digression on the rise of the drama may be doubted, especially if it means later on the exclusion of his important account of the Fabian policy. In the third decade again the selections do not always seem well managed. There is no selection from book xxiii to prepare us for the fall of Capua in xxvi; something of Scipio's plan to carry the war into Africa would have fittingly introduced us to Hannibal's departure from Italy and the meeting with Scipio in Africa. One misses also xxviii. 12, as a desirable supplement to xxi. 4.

With reference to other points, it may be stated in fairness that good traditions for the most part have been followed in constituting the text. The form *secuntur* in ix. 17. 9; 18. 17 is surely an oversight in an edition in which critical readings are in no wise discussed. Misprints, however, occur but rarely. The notes in the main are clear, though the translations they contain are sometimes rather unusual; for example, "to have contributed myself a man's part to the record" (praef. 3). On *forte quaedam divinitus* (i. 4. 4) a philosophical discussion need hardly be suggested; *nautarum* (xxi. 28. 2) is given a forced interpretation in making it refer to the natives. Grammatical principles are usually cited in full and Livian usage has been very well brought out; but when a grammar has been cited, it seems an error to cite only Professor Lane's.

O. F. LONG

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

New Greek Prose Composition. By F. E. WOODRUFF. Boston: Sibley & Co., 1905. Pp. viii + 128. \$0.90.

A revised edition of the book of 1891, substituting for the work based on *Anabasis* iii a set of lessons composed of separate sentences illustrating the essential syntactical usages more systematically. As Part i contains exercises based on *Anabasis* i and ii for use in connection with the daily reading, the book unites the two systems of instruction. It is a convenient little book for first- and second-year preparatory work.

A. G. L.

New Literature

BOOKS

CARTER, JESSE BENEDICT. The First Six Books of Virgil's Aeneid. With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1906. Abridged edition. \$1.20.

The commentary has been considerably shortened. In other respects this edition is practically identical with the first one.

CHAMPAULT, PH. Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée: Etude géographique, historique, et sociale par une méthode nouvelle. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1906. Fr. 6.

The daring thesis which Champault endeavors to establish in this work is that the land of the Phaeacians is to be identified with the island of Ischia off Cape Misenum, and that the Phaeacians were a Phoenician colony. He attempts a reconstruction of their political, commercial, and private life.

DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, H. Mythologie élémentaire des Grecs et des Romains. Paris: Hachette, 1905. Pp. 192. Fr. 1.50.

A brief manual of Greek and Roman mythology and religion, compactly arranged and appropriately illustrated.

FOWLER, H. W., AND FOWLER, F. G. The Works of Lucian Translated. Four volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905. \$4.

Complete with the exception of those pieces which are generally considered spurious. Among the latter is the *Ass*.

HENRY, ROBERT MITCHELL. Livy xxvi. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. London: Edward Arnold, 1906. Pp. xxviii + 182; one map. 2s. 6d.

A carefully made edition, suitable for college students.

LESSING, CAR. Scriptorum historiac Augustae lexicon. Fasc. 8. Leipzig: 1905. Pp. 561-640.

Like its predecessors, this fascicle has been compiled with care and discrimination. It extends from *rescindere* to the end of the letter *S*.

MARCHANT, E. C., AND UNDERHILL, G. E. Xenophon, Hellenica. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 1906. Pp. civ + 660. \$1.90.

This is a reissue in one volume of the two parts previously published separately—the Text with Critical Apparatus by Marchant, the Commentary with Introduction by Underhill. It is the first volume of an edition of Xenophon's works.

MOORE, MABEL. Carthage of the Phoenicians, in the Light of Modern Excavations. London: W. Heinemann, 1905. Pp. x + 184. With 25 plates. 6s net.

Contains an account of the Greek, Roman, and Punic remains found by French explorers in three cemeteries of ancient Carthage.

RENZ, W. Alliterationen bei Tacitus. Aschaffenburg: Schippner, 1905. Progr. Pp. 40.

Renz follows the principles laid down by Wölfflin in his studies on alliteration. He considers only those cases where it is the initial letter that is repeated and where the two (or three) words showing alliteration have the same function in the sentence. He emphasizes the fact that Tacitus, prone as he was to alliteration in plain narration as well as in the more rhetorical parts of his works, deliberately avoided hackneyed alliterative combinations. Renz has evidently made his investigation independently, but many of his results have been anticipated by Bötticher (Berlin, 1884) and Andresen (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1881, 285-91).

SHUCKBURGH, E. S. Greece: From the Coming of the Hellenes to A. D. 14. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906. Pp. xix + 416. \$1.50. One of the "Story of the Nations" series. Stress is laid upon the political, intellectual, and artistic achievements of the Greeks rather than upon the history of military operations.

VESSERAU, J. *Actna, texte Latin, publié avec traduction et commentaire.* Paris: Fontemoing, 1905. Pp. li + 104. Fr. 4.

Based for the most part on the editions of Sudhaus and Ellis, but not infrequently showing independence of judgment. On what seems to be insufficient evidence, Vesserau returns to the old theory that the poem was one of Virgil's early productions.

GOODWIN, WILLIAM WATSON. *Demos-thenes against Midias. With Critical and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix.* Cambridge: University Press New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906. Pp. viii + 188. \$2.25.

An excellent textbook. The notes show a commendable compactness: they explain and do not encumber the text. In grammatical matters the editor has attempted to give such help as students might need for a full understanding of the text without using the oration to teach Greek syntax.

ARTICLES

COLE, CHARLES N. *Quintilian's Quotations from the Latin Poets.* *Classical Review* XX (1906). 47-51.

The investigation reveals a considerable number of instances in which there is discrepancy between the text of Quintilian's quotation and the best MS tradition of the author from whom the quotation is taken. The writer concludes that Quintilian not infrequently quoted from memory, and that the readings of his versions should be treated with great caution by text-critics.

DESSAU H. *Livius and Augustus. Her- mes* XLI (1906). 142-51.

Deals with the account given by Livy (iv. 20) of the dedication of *spolia opima* in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, 317 A. u. c. In his first statement of the case Livy follows the annalists who are agreed that the spoils were dedicated by A. Cornelius Cossus, *tribunus militum*. Subsequently, however, he says that this account can not be correct because he had heard Augustus himself say that he had read an inscription on the linen corslet, one of the objects dedicated, in which Cossus was referred to as *consul*. Dessau's theory is that Augustus, for political reasons, made the communication to Livy in order to establish the principle that only one holding an independent command could dedicate *spolia opima*. Whether

Augustus had ever really seen such an inscription is, Dessau thinks, a matter that is open to question.

HALE, W. G. *Catullus Once More.* *Classical Review* XX (1906). 160-64.

A restatement of the claims of R to a primary position among the MSS of Catullus. Both internal and external evidence points to its being of the same general age with O and G.

HUELSEN, CH. *Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Forum Romanum, 1902-1904 (mit Taf. I-IV).* *Römische Mitteilungen* XX (1905). 1-119.

In this article Huelsen continues the report of the excavations in the Forum which he began in the same periodical XVII (1902). 1-97. The review covers the period from the spring of 1902 to the end of 1904, and is a contribution of great value to the literature of the subject.

KELLER, O. *Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz.* *Rheinisches Museum* LXI (1906). 78-90.

A spirited reply to the article on the same subject by Vollmer in *Philologus*, Supplementband X. 2. Keller defends his classification of the MSS into three groups, and maintains that the division into two families advocated by Vollmer is based on a complex of flimsy hypotheses. A detailed criticism of Vollmer's treatment of the famous passage *Serm. i. 6. 126* is given.

LEFORT, TH. *Notes sur le culte d'Asklépios: Nature de l'incubation dans ce culte.* *Musée Belge* X (1906). 21-37.

Beginning with a criticism of Deubner's work, *De incubatione capita quattuor* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900), Lefort maintains that in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. patients used to sleep in the temple of Asklepios, not simply because they thought that a dream would be sent to them in which they would be told by what means or remedies they could free themselves from disease, but because they believed that they would be miraculously cured by the healing powers of the god acting directly upon them.

VAN BUREN, ALBERT W. *The Temples of Castor and of Concord in the Roman Forum.* *Classical Review* XX (1906). 77-84. 5 drawings; *ibid.*, 184.

Gives the ground-plans of these two temples in the different periods of their history. The article sets forth the results of investigations made in the autumn of 1905.

GENERAL INDEX

	<small>PAGE</small>
ABBOTT, F. F., Review of Olcott, <i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae</i>	208
Ablative, Separative, Sociative, and Locative Powers of	16
With Meaning of "In Accordance with"	12, 13, 146
Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus</i> 860	226, 229
Alesia, View of	142
American Doctoral Dissertations	211, 233
Philological Association	85
School at Athens	24, 232
School in Rome	121, 230, 232
Archaeological Institute of America	85
Ariovistus before His Interview with Caesar, The Movements of	213
BECHTEL, E. A., Review of Robinson, <i>Selections from Roman Law</i>	93
BILL, C. P., Review of Rouse's edition of Arnold, <i>On Translating Homer</i>	167
BISHOP, J. REMSEN, Review of Ashmore, <i>The Classics and Modern Training</i>	243
BONNER, CAMPBELL, Review of: Harry, <i>Aeschylus, Prometheus</i>	124, 229
Croiset (Heffelbower), <i>History of Greek Literature</i>	30
BONNER, ROBERT J., <i>Rapuit, Virgil, Aeneid i.</i> 176	49
BOOK REVIEWS:	
Abbott, <i>Mather A.</i> , <i>A First Latin Writer</i>	60
Ashmore, <i>Sidney G.</i> , <i>The Classics and Modern Training</i>	243
Bates, <i>William N.</i> , <i>Euripides, Iphigenia in Tauris</i>	87
Benner, <i>A. R.</i> , <i>Selections from Homer's Iliad</i>	91
Bennett, <i>Charles E.</i> , <i>Preparatory Latin Writer</i>	61
Bennett, <i>Charles E.</i> , <i>Virgil, Aeneid i-vi</i>	206
Blass, <i>F.</i> , <i>Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee</i>	58
Burton, <i>Harry Edwin</i> , <i>Selections from Livy</i>	245
Butcher, <i>S. H.</i> , <i>Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects</i>	205
Carter, <i>Jesse B.</i> , <i>The Religion of Numa</i>	240
Croiset, <i>Alfred and Maurice</i> , <i>History of Greek Literature (Heffelbower)</i>	30
Daniell, <i>M. G.</i> , and Brown, <i>S. L.</i> , <i>New Latin Composition</i>	204
Dill, <i>Samuel</i> , <i>Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius</i>	90
D'Ooge, <i>B. L.</i> , <i>Latin Composition for Secondary Schools</i>	27
Dotev, <i>A. I.</i> , <i>Latin Exercise Book</i>	62
Dougan, <i>T. W.</i> , <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	126
Drew, <i>W. P.</i> , <i>The Gospel of Mark</i>	161
Earle, <i>M. L.</i> , <i>The Medea of Euripides</i>	165
Fowler, <i>H. N.</i> , <i>A History of Ancient Greek Literature</i>	207
Furtwängler, <i>A.</i> , and Urlichs, <i>H. L.</i> , <i>Denkmäler griechischer und römischer</i>	
Sculptur	163
Gulick, <i>C. B.</i> , <i>The Life of the Ancient Greeks</i>	55
Harris, <i>Ella I.</i> , <i>The Tragedies of Seneca</i>	57
Harry, <i>J. E.</i> , <i>Aeschylus, Prometheus</i>	124

<i>Heffelbower, see Croiset.</i>	
<i>Johnston, H. W.</i> , The Private Life of the Romans	28
<i>Laing, G. J.</i> , Selections from Ovid	164
<i>Lamberton, W. A.</i> , Thucydides ii, iii	203
<i>Lease, Emory B.</i> , Livy i, xxi, xxii	56
<i>Marchant, E. C.</i> , Greek Reader	242
<i>Merrill, W. A.</i> , Latin Hymns	123
<i>Mustard, Wilfred P.</i> , Classical Echoes in Tennyson	25
<i>Olcott, George N.</i> , Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicæ	208
<i>Pearson, H. C.</i> , Essentials of Latin for Beginners	59
<i>Ransom, Caroline L.</i> , Studies in Ancient Furniture	160
<i>Robinson, James J.</i> , Selections from Roman Law	93
<i>Rouse, W. H. D.</i> , Mathew Arnold, On Translating Homer	167
<i>Smith, C. F.</i> , Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i> i-iv	89
<i>Thompson, John</i> , An Elementary Greek Grammar for Schools	241
<i>Weir, Irene</i> , The Greek Painter's Art	94
<i>West, W. M.</i> , The Ancient World	127
<i>Woodruff, F. E.</i> , New Greek Prose Composition	246
<i>Wyse, William</i> , The Speeches of Isaeus	92
Brief Study of Some of Caesar's Ablatives	146
Broader Outlook for Students of Cicero	221
BUCK, C. D. , The General Linguistic Conditions in Ancient Italy and Greece	99
Caesar, Recent Literature	131
A Brief Study of Some Ablatives in	146
CALL, LEONA A. , Review of Benner, Selections from Homer's Iliad	91
Captivi of Plautus, Presentation of	51
Catholic Institutions, The Study of Latin in	158
Cicero, Broader Outlook in the Study of	221
Classical Association of England and Wales	121
Middle West and South	1, 5, 67, 129, 157, 209
New England	121, 230
New York	121
Classical Conference, Michigan Schoolmasters' Club	159
National Educational Association	22
Southern California	202
State Teachers' Meetings	65, 120
Classical Journal	3
Classical Seminars	231
COLE, CHARLES N. , Review of Laing, Selections from Ovid	164
CORRESPONDENCE	197
Delphic Oracle	37
DENNISON, WALTER , Recent Caesar Literature	131
Review of Bennett, Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> i-vi	206
DISCUSSIONS:	
The Meaning of <i>δέσμα</i> , Aeschylus, Prometheus 860	226, 229
Xenophon, <i>Anabasis</i> i. 7. 5	224, 225
D'OOGE, M. L. , Review of Bates, Euripides, <i>Iphigenia in Tauris</i>	87
Early Legends and Recent Discoveries	78

EDITORIALS:

American Doctoral Dissertations (1900-1905)	211
The Classical Association of the Middle West and South	1
The Classical Journal	3
M. Ingres on the Value of Classical Studies	35
"Old Greek"	66
The Present Status of the Association (February, 1906)	67
President James's Inaugural Address	33
The Second Meeting of the Association	129
The Spirit of Research	97
The St. Louis Meeting	209
The State Teachers' Meetings	65
Experiment in the Teaching of First- and Second-Year Latin	7
FAIRBANKS, ARTHUR, Herodotus and the Oracle at Delphi	37
Review of: Ransom, Studies in Ancient Furniture	160
Weir, The Greek Painter's Art	94
First-Year Latin	7, 69, 199
FITZPATRICK, MARY R., Review of Daniell and Brown, New Latin Composition	204
General Linguistic Conditions in Ancient Italy and Greece	99
HALE, W. G., An Experiment in the Teaching of First- and Second-Year Latin	7
HARRY, J. E., The Meaning of <i>δέξεται</i> , Aeschylus, Prometheus 860	226
Herodotus and the Oracle at Delphi	37
JOHNSTON, H. W., Sanity in First-Year Latin	69
LAIRD, A. G., The Oracle in Herodotus v. 79	20
Xenophon, Anabasis i. 7-5	224
Review of: Blass, Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee	58
Woodruff, New Greek Prose Composition	246
Wyse, The Speeches of Isaeus	92
"Latin Commencement" at the South Omaha High School	52
LEASE, EMORY B., Correspondence	197
Livy xxi. 1	19
LONG, O. F., Review of Burton, Selections from Livy	245
MAIN, J. H. T., Review of Smith, Anabasis i-iv	89
MANLY, W. G., Review of Gulick, The Life of the Ancient Greeks	55
MEADER, CLARENCE L., Review of Bennett, Preparatory Latin Writer	61
MILLER, F. J., Review of: Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius	90
Harris, The Tragedies of Seneca	57
MILLER, WALTER, Review of: Drew, Gospel of Mark	161
Merrill, Latin Hymns	123
Mustard, Classical Echoes in Tennyson	25
Thompson, An Elementary Greek Grammar for Schools	241
MOSS, CHARLES M., Review of Marchant, Greek Reader	242
Movements of Arioistus before His Interview with Caesar	213
NELSON, J. RALEIGH, Review of Dotey, Latin Exercise Book	62
NEWCOMER, CHARLES B., Review of Earle, The Medea of Euripides	165
NEW LITERATURE	31, 63, 95, 168, 247
NOTES:	
The Chronology of Livy	155

The Oracle in Herodotus v. 79	20
Rapuit in Virgil, Aeneid i. 176	49
The Source of the Error in Livy xxi. 18. 1	19
Xenophon, Anabasis i. 7. 5.	155, 224, 225
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	85
Philology and Classical Philology	160
PICKARD, JOHN, Review of Furtwängler and Urlichs, <i>Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Sculptur</i>	163
PLATNER, SAMUEL BALL, Early Legends and Recent Discoveries	78
POTTER, FRANKLIN H., A Recent Beginner's Book	151
Princeton University, Preceptorial System of	84, 209
Recent Beginner's Book	151
Recent Caesar Literature	131
REPORTS FROM THE CLASSICAL FIELD	21, 51, 84, 120, 157, 199, 230
REVIEWS: see BOOK REVIEWS	
Roman Cena at Lewis Institute	200
SANDERS, HENRY A., The Chronology of Livy	155
The Source of the Error in Livy xxi. 18. 1	19
Review of: Dougan, M. <i>Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanae Disputationes Lease</i> , Livy i, xxi, xxii	126, 56, 198
Sanity in First-Year Latin	69
SCHLICHER, J. J., Review of; Abbott, First Latin Writer	60
D'Ooge, Latin Composition for Secondary Schools	27
Pearson, Essentials of Latin for Beginners	59
Second-Year Latin	11, 138
Secondary Schools, Status of Classical Studies in	111
SHEFFIELD, J. H., A Brief Study of Some of Caesar's Ablatives	146
SHIPLEY, F. W., Review of Johnston, <i>The Private Life of the Romans</i>	28
SHOREY, PAUL, Philology and Classical Philology	169
Xenophon, Anabasis i. 7. 5	155
SHOWERMAN, GRANT, Review of: Butcher, <i>Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects</i>	205
Carter, The Religion of Numa	240
SMALLEY, FRANK, Status of Classical Studies in Secondary Schools	111
SMITH, C. F., Review of Lamberton, <i>Thucydides ii and iii</i>	203
Status of Classical Studies in Secondary Schools	111
STUART, D. R., Review of West, <i>Ancient World</i>	127
Subjunctive, Principal Uses of, tabulated	14
SUPER, CHARLES W., Xenophon, Anabasis i. 7. 5	225
Syracuse University, Statistics of Courses in	113
Tennessee Philological Association	85
Virgil, Aeneid i. 176	49
Vocabulary, Forms, and Syntax in First-Year Latin	199 ✓
WALKER, A. T., The Movements of Arioistus before His Interview with Caesar	213
The First Meeting of the Association	5
WESTERMANN, W. L., Review of Fowler, <i>A History of Ancient Greek Literature</i>	207
Xenophon, Anabasis i. 7. 5	155, 224, 225
YOUNGLOVE, EMMA, A Broader Outlook for Students of Cicero	221

GENERAL LIBRARY,
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
NOV 17 1906

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

Volume I

JUNE, 1906

Number 7

Editorial

**The Movements of Ariovistus before His Interview
with Caesar**

Arthur Tappan Walker

A Broader Outlook for Students of Cicero

Emma Younglove

Notes and Discussions

Xenophon *Anabasis* i. 7. 3

A. G. Laird

Xenophon *Anabasis* i. 7. 5 Again

Charles W. Super

The Meaning of *Μήτερα*, Aeschylus *Prometheus* 860

J. E. Harry and Campbell Bonner

Reports from the Classical Field

Book Reviews

The Religion of Numa and Other Essays on the Religion of Ancient Rome,
Carter (Shoemaker)—*An Elementary Greek Grammar for Schools*, Thompson
(W. M.)—*Greek Reader*, Marchant (Moss)—*The Classics and Modern Training*,
Ashmore (Bishop)—*Selections from Livy*, Burton (Long)—*New Greek
Prose Composition*, Woodruff (A. C. L.)

New Literature

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published monthly from November to June inclusive, and devoted to the interests
of classical teachers in schools and colleges

Managing Editors

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS
(University of Iowa)

GORDON J. LAING
(University of Chicago)

Associate Editors

ABRAM BROWN
(East High School, Columbus, O.)

WALTER MILLER
(Tulane University)

A. G. LAIRD
(University of Wisconsin)

HENRY A. SANDERS
(University of Michigan)

J. J. SCHLICHER
(Indiana State Normal School)

JUNE, 1906

EDITORIAL

The St. Louis Meeting—American Doctoral Dissertations, 1900-1905 209
THE MOVEMENTS OF ARIOVISTUS BEFORE HIS INTERVIEW WITH CAESAR

ARTHUR TAPPAN WALKER 213
221

A BROADER OUTLOOK FOR STUDENTS OF CICERO

EMMA YOUNGLOVE

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

Xenophon *Anabasis* i. 7. 5 A. G. LAIRD 224
Xenophon *Anabasis* i. 7. 5 Again CHARLES W. SUPER 225
The Meaning of *Alcera*, Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 860 J. E. HARRY AND CAMPBELL BONNER 226

REPORTS FROM THE CLASSICAL FIELD

The New England Classical Association—The American School of Classical Studies in Rome—The Classical Seminars (1906-7)—Students and Instructors Abroad Next Year—The New Director of the School at Athens—Fellows in the School at Rome, 1906-7—Leland Stanford Jr. University—Recent Changes—University of Michigan—Doctor's Dissertations in the Classics 230

BOOK REVIEWS

The Religion of Numa and Other Essays on the Religion of Ancient Rome, Carter (Shoemaker)—*An Elementary Greek Grammar for Schools*, Thompson (W. M.)—*Greek Reader*, Marchant (Moss)—*The Classics and Modern Training*, Ashmore (Bishop)—*Selections from Livy*, Burton (Long)—*New Greek Prose Composition*, Woodruff (A. G. L.) 240

NEW LITERATURE

247

Editorial communications and manuscripts should be sent either to Professor Arthur Fairbanks, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, or to Professor Gordon J. Laing, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Fifty reprints of original articles will be furnished gratis to authors. Additional copies, if ordered in advance of publication, will be supplied at cost.

Business correspondence should be addressed to the University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription: \$1.50 a year. Single copies, 25 cents. Postage prepaid by the publishers for subscriptions in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Canal Zone (Republic of Panama), Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Tutuila (Samoa), Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents for postage should be added to the subscription price. Remittances should be made payable to the University of Chicago Press and should be in Chicago or New York exchange, postal or express money order. If local check is used 10 cents must be added for collection.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when they have been lost in transit.

The following agents are recognized:

For the European Continent: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, 14 Querstrasse, Leipzig, Germany.

For Great Britain: DAVID NUTT, 57 Long Acre, London, W. C., Eng.

Entered May 16, 1906, at the Post Office at Chicago as second-class matter under Act of Congress, July 16, 1894.

